

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XI.—No. 43.

JULY, 1935.

ON SIX PLAYS IN *BEAUMONT AND FLETCHER*, 1679

BY R. WARWICK BOND

ALL things change, and other palms are won. These remarks, made by poets who could themselves defy the tendency, seem sadly applicable to-day to the *par nobile fratrum*, Beaumont and Fletcher. The untimely cessation of the late Arthur Bullen's *Variorum* edition, which was hampered by the contemporary appearance of the merely textual and much cheaper one in the Cambridge English Classics, left me with much completed work useless upon my hands. I take some pleasure, now, to think that Bullen relied upon my humble self for nearly one-quarter of the whole great effort, though among his coadjutors were some who have since attained a distinguished position. I have a letter from him of March 7, 1896, requesting me to edit eleven named plays, to which he afterwards added a twelfth and the introduction to another. Despite my other tasks and the unfortunate delays in appearance, I contrived to execute my share while still in touch with the threads of a complicated matter; so that after six of my plays and the odd introduction had appeared in vols. i-iii, I still had six others completed yet unpublished. I turned to other things, and removed to Nottingham in 1911. It is some years now since I resigned that chair and resumed purely literary work; but only lately did I bethink me of my derelict plays, which contained some novel

matter. Textual work, footnotes, etc., are practically useless without a text; all I can attempt here is to embody what I ascertained on sources, and connected questions of date and authorship. Quite possibly something of this has since been anticipated in the growing mass of periodicals: all I am conscious of is the late G. C. Macaulay's good chapter in vol. vi of the *Cambridge History of Literature*, 1910, Prof. C. M. Gayley's *Francis Beaumont*, of 1914, and Mr. E. C. Oliphant's harvesting of long labours in his *Beaumont and Fletcher*, 1927; but these little, if at all, affect what here follows.

THE DOUBLE MARRIAGE

The argument is as follows:

On the discovery of a plot against Ferrand, tyrant of Naples, Violet the leader conceals himself. Torture fails to draw from his heroic wife Juliana his hiding-place, so Ferrand makes insincere offer of a pardon if the conspirators undertake an expedition against an aggrieved Duke of Sesse who has turned pirate and captured his nephew Ascanio. Violet accepts, but is himself captured and joins Ascanio in the hold of Sesse's ship. His lofty bearing inspires a passion in Martia, the duke's Amazon daughter, who effects their escape with herself to shore on condition that Violet marries her. But on reaching land and realising his wife's sad state Violet, torn with remorse, declines to consummate the marriage he has just celebrated with Martia; and that virago, after insulting interviews with the couple, joins the tyrant's minister Ronvere and becomes Ferrand's mistress. But Sesse, landed with his crew, passes them and himself off as Swiss bodyguards and attacks the tyrant during an entertainment. Ferrand takes refuge in the keep; but the city rises, the keep is stormed, and the tyrant beheaded. The triumph, however, is marred by the untoward death of Violet, killed in mistake for Ronvere by his own Juliana, who dies of grief immediately; while Sesse, sickened by the need of slaying his own daughter Martia, resigns the crown to Ascanio.

The historical source, not heretofore traced, is the *Memoires* of Philippe de Comines, whose 7th Book, narrating the spectacular invasion of Italy by Charles VIII of France, gives details in Chaps. XI-XIV of the tyranny and downfall of the Arragonese kings of Naples, to wit: (1) Ferrand or Ferdinand I, who died January 25, 1496, in terror of the French, who had entered Rome December 31; (2) his son Alfonso (Duke of Calabria), who soon abdicated, after installing his son, (3) Ferrand II. He, after a feint of resistance at San Germano, retreated to Naples, and on the revolt of the nobles and people withdrew to Ischia, while the French were

joyfully received. Our dramatist, suppressing all mention of the French invasion, shows a single tyrant Ferrand and substitutes as deliverer the Duke of Sesse,¹ himself also Prince of Rossano, who properly belongs to a period about thirty-five years earlier, when he rebelled against Ferrand I, whose sister Eleanor he had married.² He was imprisoned in the castle in 1464 and put to death in 1486. De Comines, less perfectly acquainted with Italian affairs, distinguishes the Duke from the Prince of Rossano, as does our dramatist, II, i, 148 :

"[Alphonse] en feit aussi mourir deux autres, que le pere auoit pris sus sa seureté : dont l'un estoit Duc de Sesse, homme de grande autorité, & l'autre Prince de Rosane, qui auoit eu à espouse & à femme la sœur dudict Roy Ferrand, & en auoit eu un tresbeau fils" (Chapter XI)—the Ascanio of our play.

But whatever trifling discrepancies we may notice, all doubt that Comines is the authority followed, and that not in the original but in Thomas Danett's translation 1596 folio, will be removed by a few comparisons.

Danett, Chapter XI, p. 294,
1596 fol.

The Double Marriage

(of Ferrand I) "no man could be acquainted with his humour . . . at feasts and bankets he tooke and betrayed men.

I, ii, 32-47 Ferrand at a banquet.

"his nearest kinsmen and friends haue often told me" of his cruelties and exactions

II, iii, 24-32 report by Ascanio his nephew to Virolet.

"he vsed within his realme all trade of merchandise himself. . . where the oile oliue groweth (namely in Pouille) he and his sonne bought it all vp at their owne price . . . they vsed to take from them the races of their horses . . . and cause them to be broken and kept to their own vse . . . which also they sent to feede in the

I, i, 90-103 "all the country's fat He wholly does engross unto himself;

Our oils he buys at his own price, then sells them

To us at dearer rates . . .

The races of our horses he takes from us,

Yet keeps them in our pastures; rapes of matrons

¹ His family name was Marzano (perhaps suggesting "Martia" as name of his daughter); in Simoneta's *Rerum Gestarum Francisci Sphortiae*, lib. xxx, sig. K2 (? 1480) he is called "Marinus Martianus, Suessanorum dux," Sease, Suessa, or Sinuessa being a cathedral town seventeen miles north-west of Capua.

² Summonte, *Historia della Città e Regno di Napoli* (1602-43), Part III, pp. 369, 379-80. Part III, only published in 1640, was inaccessible to our dramatist.

Danett, Chapter XI, p. 294,
1596 fol.

pastures of their noble men. . . .
Both of them had forced many
women; and as touching the
Church, they had it in no reuerence
. . . so far foorth that they sold
Bishoprikes for monie; as for
example, the Bishoprike of Tarente
sold to a Jew by King Ferrande for
thirteene thousand ducats "

Book VIII, Chapter XIII, p. 357
(many suspicions and jealousies
to which princes are liable on very
slight occasion)

The Double Marriage

And virgins are too frequent . . .
for religion
It is a thing he dreams not of. I
have heard
(How true it is I know not) that he
sold
The bishoprick of Tarent to a Jew
For thirteene thousand ducats "

i, iii, 32-67 "These meats are
poison'd: hang the cooks!
(To musicians) No note more
On forfeit of your fingers! do you
envy me
A minute's slumber? " etc.

The story of these Arragonese princes inspired De Comines with an interesting passage on the hollowness and insecurity of princes' lives (Book VIII, Chapter XIII, p. 357, Danett)—a familiar Shakespearean theme to which we may also relate Fletcher's earlier speech for Wolsey on his fall. The sentiment may well be the origin of the whole comic relief of Castruccio in this play; though his mock-progress through the city in III, ii, so rudely broken by Sesse and his crew, may have a more direct original in De Comines' record of the cowardly surrender of royal state by King Alfonso on the French invasion—

" Upon his sonnes returne from Rome, [he] put him in possession of the realme, and caused him to be crowned, and to ride about the streets of the citie accompanied with the noblest personages that were there " (Book VII, Chapter XI, p. 296).

But of course Reed was right in fathering the later scene of Castruccio disappointed of his banquet (v, i) on Sancho Panza in *Don Quixote*, Part II, Chapter 47 (1615).

Sesse's "Swissers" are the "Almains" left by Ferrand to defend the castle, and his purchase of them is represented in Danett by the French assailants allowing them to retain his "moveables" within it. A few names in the play are also from De Comines. Ascanio is from the Cardinal Ascanio of Chapters X and XII, Alexander VI's former rival for the Papacy, who joined the French; "Camillo Pendolfo," sent by Ferrand I to divert Charles from his expedition (Chapter XI), gives our play Camillo and Pandulpho;

Brissonet occurs at the end of Chapter XII as a bishop of St. Malo, made cardinal on Charles' request, while Ronvere, not named in this part of De Comines' text, occurs in a note by Danett as prefect of Rome.

Two plays of Shakespeare are recalled. Köppel and others have noted a close resemblance to *Julius Caesar*, II, i (Brutus, Portia, and page), in the opening scene of ours, which alludes to Brutus and has a page called Lucio. I know not if any has yet observed that our banished duke and his seafaring mates, Sesse's long tale to his daughter of the cause of his exile (II, i), her passion for and help of her father's captive (as Miranda) and the close concern of the play with these same Arragonese Kings of Naples (for Alphonso = Alfonso, and our Ferrand is (alas !) Ferdinand grown-up) are all closely, though not obviously, reminiscent of *The Tempest*, a play to which Fletcher returns more openly in *The Sea-Voyage*, licensed June 22, 1622. The date of ours, which lacks Burbage's name among the actors (he died March 13, 1618-19) and does not figure in Herbert's Office-book (Malone's extracts only begin with March 14, 1622), is commonly, and reasonably, stated as c. 1620, but let us say 1621, as Cervantes' Second Part was only Englished in that year.

That date excludes Beaumont (d. March 6, 1616) from the authorship. Boyle first in *Eng. Studien*, 1882-87, claimed a large share for Massinger, whom Fleay followed pretty closely with the additional suggestion that he was reviser (under title of *The Unfortunate Piety*, 1631), rather than collaborator, and Oliphant's recent book (p. 508) supports revision. My own impression corresponds most nearly with Fleay's allotment, which is this :

Mass. : I ; III, i ; IV, i, ii ; V, i, ii, iv (i, ii, a revision).

Flet. : II ; III, ii, iii ; IV, iii, iv ; V, iii.

Only in the parts here assigned to Fletcher are "ye" and "'em" at all prominent (almost absent elsewhere) ; and since I also find in V, i and ii respectively 80 per cent. and 72 per cent. of double-endings, I cannot think that Massinger, whose general average of them is only 42-50 per cent., did much revision in those two scenes. I may add that I have fully confirmed the share here assigned to him by a great number of striking parallels of phrase from his own nearly contemporary piece *The Duke of Milan*, printed 1623 quarto, parallels, however, which space does not allow of here. A decidedly interesting play, despite an occasional failure of naturalness in the parts of Virolet, Juliana and Pandulpho.

THE MAID IN THE MILL

was licensed by Herbert for the King's men on August 29, 1623, as "written by Fletcher and Rowley." The latter is credited with most of Act II, all Act IV, and a little elsewhere: it may be more informing to say that, while the conduct of the main plot (the relations of Antonio and Martine with Ismenia and Aminta, and the two fathers' connection therewith) is pretty evenly divided between the two authors, Fletcher's share includes the whole relation of Otrante and Florimel, and Rowley's all the scenes in which the Miller, his wife, and the irrepressible Bustofa appear. The sources have long been known: the Antonio-Ismenia plot is from the Spanish romance *Gerardo*, translated by Leonard Digges, 1622; the Otrante-Florimel-Franio plot from *Bandello* (Nov. XV of Second Part), as enlarged by Belleforest in the twelfth of his XVIII *Histoires Tragiques*, 1564, and literally translated from the latter by Painter, Tom. II, 1567. Further, there is frank imitation of *Romeo and Juliet* in the first-sight passion, balcony-scene, street-quarrel, and family-feud reconciled, of the main plot; and of *The Winter's Tale* in Florimel's finding, rescue from a bear by Gillian, a rich mantle, an oafish foster-brother and a rustic festival. The tailor Vertigo and his treatment by the wits may remember barber Motto in Lyly's *Midas*, 1592, 4°.

LOVE'S CURE

cannot date before 1625, and must claim brief statement of its argument.

During Alvarez' twenty years' exile from Seville, the little daughter Clara, who accompanied him, has assumed male dress and inured herself in a warlike time to all martial exercises; while Lucio, the son born soon after his departure, has for safety's sake been brought up by his mother Eugenia as a woman—an education which now, on Alvarez' return, must in both cases be reversed. In an attack on him by Vitelli, nephew of the don whose slaughter has caused his exile, Alvarez is effectively aided by his martial daughter, but the dawn of sudden love induces her to plead for their enemy's life. Vitelli returns her passion, but is still in bonds to a mistress Malroda, kept in a conniving Alguazir's (constable's) house, where, however, she receives another admirer, the swordsman Piorato. Piorato, hired to teach the womanish Lucio the use of his weapon, hears of Vitelli's new flame and reports it to Malroda. The latter, while making

it a pretext for quarrelling with and extracting money and jewels from the don, betrays him to a preconcerted attack by Piorato and some rascally mechanics suborned by the Alguazir. Clara, brought by Piorato to witness her lover's frailty, once more becomes his saviour, and secures his promise of marriage. Meantime, Lucio has found a motive for courage in an attack made on his father by the Alguazir's thievish crew. A passion for Genevora, Vitelli's sister, enhances the manly impulse; and under the sting of her rebuke of his submission to the insult of a rival, Lamoral, he challenges and overcomes him. Finally, the determination of the family feud by a public duel is averted by the women's threat of self-destruction, and a reconciliation and double marriage is effected. The comedy of an absurd conflict between nature and education in both Clara and Lucio is largely assisted by Bobadilla the steward, and this element is reinforced by the relations between the constable and his tools.

The main action, the correction by love-passion of natural sex-instincts perverted by habit, is closely borrowed from a comedy *La Fuerza de la Costumbre* of the Valencian poet Guillen de Castro, author of two dozen plays, including the two parts of *Las Mocedades del Cid*, on which Corneille founded his more famous tragedy. Of these plays twelve were published at Valencia in 1621 and the rest at the same place in 1626.¹ *La Fuerza* affords originals for all our leading characters save Malroda, and some suggestion even for Bobadilla and the Alguazir, as will be apparent to those who will compare the English play in Dyce's edition of Beaumont and Fletcher with the following *précis* of the Spanish made by me in 1905-6 for Bullen's edition. Struck by the inadequacy of suggestions of source then known to me, and aware of Spanish sources for other of the plays, I had begun to ferret, and in Aribau's collection on the shelves of the Reading-Room noticed the very promising title of this play by Guillen de Castro. Though no Spanish scholar, I attempted it with the aid of a Spanish dictionary, and copy here what I then wrote with the addition only of a few further parallels with the English play. Later, about July, 1908, I chanced to meet a Mr. J. A. Jacobi, then I think composing a doctoral thesis on Beaumont and Fletcher, who informed me that my discovery had been anticipated by A. L. Stiefel. Neither then did I, nor since have I, consulted Stiefel's essay, which I learn from the *Cambridge Hist. of Lit.* vi, 540, is in Herrig's *Archiv für die neueren Sprachen*,

¹ Mr. E. H. C. Oliphant in *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*, 1927, p. 417, states that *La Fuerza*, etc., "was only licensed for printing in Spain on February 7, 1624-25, and published some three months later."

Vol. XCIX, pp. 271 310 (1897): nor have I anywhere seen any detailed account of the Spanish play. I already knew that Stiefel was right, and quite fail to understand the *Cambridge History's* view that there is "no real ground for the suggestion: . . . the two dramas are founded on the same story, but the treatment is entirely different."¹ The resemblances are too numerous and close to be denied; though it is equally plain that *Love's Cure* has enlarged and improved the Spanish material, eliminating some repetition, introducing some variety in Bobadilla, developing a hint of jealousy in the heroine into the important underplot of Vitelli, Malroda, and Piorato (an underplot quite wanting in the Spanish piece), and adding the Alguazir with his rascally crew. Also the English piece has deferred the love-interest of Lucio till a late point in the play (iv, 4), and introduced the family feud of Alvarez and Vitelli which gives us the proposed public duel and a more dramatic *dénouement*. This obvious improvement and strengthening certainly need not rob Stiefel of the credit of first discovering and announcing the main source, which credit I had promised myself but must now renounce. Here is my own account of the Spanish piece, which I have not seen since 1905-6:

At the opening Don Felix, dressed in a long robe, asks his mother, Costanza, why she has put off her mourning and stripped the walls of their customary black (*Love's Cure*, I, ii, 96), and is told of his father Don Pedro's flight to Flanders twenty years before in consequence of a quarrel with her own father, who has since left her his sole heir. Pedro, who has commanded an infantry regiment for the king in Flanders, is now returning; and, the tale done, he enters with their daughter Hipolita dressed as a man, who had accompanied his flight and has become proficient in martial accomplishments. Costanza explains that she has reared her son in "habito largo," not as destined for the Church but to keep him at her side night and day, lest she lose her one consolation. Pedro decides that the habits of both must now be changed, but learns from Felix's Ayo or tutor, who with a comic servant Galvan offers faint suggestion for Bobadilla, that his son is a coward. Much comic business follows on the re-entry of Hipolita and Felix in dress more appropriate to their sex, and the efforts of father and mother to impart to either the proper tone (*Love's Cure*, II, ii). The clash of swords is heard: Felix shrinks behind his mother; Pedro goes out, and Hipolita, flinging away her high-heeled shoes, draws her brother's sword and follows. Some street-affair has brought Don Luis, who is accompanied by his sister Leonor, into conflict with Pedro's servants. All re-enter: Hipolita challenges Luis; Leonor faints in Felix's arms. Luis, soon reduced to

¹ Vol. VI, Appendix to Chapter V, p. 140.

beg for mercy, is spared by Hipolita, who is already enamoured of his bravery; while Felix at the same time feels the first stirring of love for Leonor (*Love's Cure*, I, iii, 74-110).

In the second Act Costanza gives Hipolita another lesson in deportment, while a "*mæstro de armas*," is brought in by the Ayo to instruct Felix. Hipolita finds her brother's lesson the more attractive, and is soon flourishing his foil, when Pedro enters and chides her—

Siempre insistes en querer
Ser hombre, siendo mujer?

Cf. Alvarez *Love's Cure*, II, ii.:

How now, Clara,
Your breeches on still?

He lectures Felix on the use of the weapon, bidding him attack vigorously—

"dale al mæstro
Una herida muy bien dada"

[*Love's Cure*, III, iv, 69: On sir! put home! etc.]

Felix of course is worsted and abandons the effort in despair; but Hipolita seizes the foil and promptly avenges his discomfiture on the swordsman [Clara and Piorato in *Love's Cure*, III, iv, 95-100]. Felix, spurred by his father's reproaches, vows to do better, and, on Pedro's later attempt to test his courage by attacking him in disguise in the street, while showing fear has some idea of resistance [*Love's Cure*, IV, iii, 50-62]. Meanwhile Hipolita has made friends with Leonor, and encourages the feeling between Felix and the latter, who on one occasion throws him a glove from her window. He is immediately deprived of it by a rival suitor Otavio, and fails to resent the injury. Leonor lectures him and gives him a second favour in the shape of a feather [*Love's Cure*, II, ii, Vitelli begs 'your feather' as a favour from Clara]. When Pedro attempts to chastise him for his cowardice he is confronted by Hipolita, who champions her brother, while Pedro laments the contrary nature of his children. He bids Felix take example by Luis, who has just been wounded in another fray, and Felix once more resolves to do great things and avenge his insults received.

In the third (and last) Act he meets beneath Leonor's window Otavio, insolently wearing in his hat the captured glove. Felix challenges him, but desires to have the combat in a more retired spot [*Love's Cure*, V, i, 17-18], to which they adjourn, Leonor, who misunderstands the scene, declaring she will have no more to do with such a coward. But on the ramparts Felix fights and overcomes his opponent, whom he magnanimously spares: a sympathizing captain, who has observed his conduct, assists his escape from arrest by an Alguacil; and finally he presents Otavio's sword and hat with the glove in it to Leonor, who accepts him as her husband [these relations of Otavio, Felix, and Leonor are closely reproduced in those of Lamoral, Lucio, and Genevora in *Love's Cure*, IV, iv; V, i, ii]. Concurrently the passion between Luis and Hipolita

has developed. She has confessed to her mother a changed nature—love for Don Luis lowers her voice and checks her manly spirit (*Love's Cure*, III, iv, 16–23), and abandoning a jealousy felt or feigned of another lady, she surrenders herself to him.

De Castro's martial heroine may derive from an incident at the siege of Ostend (July, 1601—September, 1604), where a young Spanish woman in male attire was found among the slain at the assault on the Sandhill, January 7, 1602. This is related in Emmanuel Meteren's *Hist. of the Netherlands*, issued first in Latin (n.d.) and rewritten by him in Flemish (Delft, 1599, and later, carrying the history to 1612): he notes that the woman had a gold chain and jewels under her dress, and mentions another (Frisian) girl, who fought on the Dutch side for seven years, ordinarily wearing a white feather. A French translation of Meteren by I. D. L. Haije (La Haye, 1618, fol.) seems to have been used by our authors rather than Edward Grimeston's *A True Historie of the Memorable Siege of Ostend . . . Translated out of French . . .* London . . . 1604, 4^o (p. 108), because the latter has no mention of Jeanne Balam, the fasting maid of Confolens in Poitou, to whom Fleay first referred Pachieco's "miraculous maid in Flanders," II, i, 26, of whom Meteren does report the loss of the use of her limbs for six months, and how "ses boyaulx s'estoyent entirement fermés et reserrés" (ed. 1618, Book XXIII, ff. 506–7). But Meteren says nothing of her "living three years on the smell of a rose," *Love's Cure*, II, i, 30, which probably relates rather to Eva Fliegen of Meurs in the Rhenish duchy of Clèves, said to have supported life for sixteen years by smelling sweet flowers.¹ The three years' fast of the maid of Confolens was the subject of a ballad (?) entered to James Roberts, October 29, 1603²; and as early as Lyly's *Campaspe* 1581–2 (I, ii, 63) Apelles, like Pachieco here, reminds his hungry page Psyllus that "some haue liued by sauours."

The most dramatic scene, Malroda's teaching to Vitelle (IV, ii), is borrowed from a similar scene in the Spanish romance *Gerardo* as translated by Leonard Digges, 1622, which had already been the source of Fletcher and Massinger's *The Spanish Curate* (1622) and of the main plot in Fletcher and Rowley's *Maid in the Mill* (1623). The hero, Gerardo, is betrayed in his fickle Clara's chamber

¹ *Shirburn Ballads*, 1585–1616, edited by Andrew Clark, Clarendon Press, 1907, No. X, date 1613.

² *Sta. Register*, ed. Arber, iii, 245.

to a preconcerted attack ; but escapes, leaving " Hat, Cloke and Pistoll as spoiles behind " him [cf. *Love's Cure*, IV, iii, 1]. Later Clara excuses herself as urged by her kindred to compel his fulfilment of an alleged promise of marriage [cf. *Love's Cure*, III, iii, 95 sqq. ; IV, ii, 142-43] ; but soon after he is subjected to a second night-attack by his rival Rodrigo, who corresponds to our Piorato, and again forfeits cloak, hat and sword [cf. the second exploit of the Alguazir's crew in *Love's Cure*, IV, iii, 56 ff.]. In *Gerardo* occurs the expression in *cuervo* used in *Love's Cure*, II, i, 2, and the names of two of our *dramatis personæ*, " Sayavedra " and " Mendoza "—the former, however, a name of Cervantes, and the latter of a Spanish admiral at Ostend, as well as of the creator of the original Lazarillo, 1553. Most of our names, indeed, are from Ostend or the earlier history of the struggle. Spinola is the Spanish general ; a Don Alvarez de Suarez was slain in the assault of January 7, 1602 ; Vitelli was *maréchal de camp* of the army that marched into the Netherlands in 1567, Pacheco the engineer who fortified Antwerp, Lamoral the name of the famous Count Egmont.

In regard to authorship, not only does the Prologue at a revival imply that the play is not definitely known as Beaumont and Fletcher's, but its appearance in Folio 1 on a separate leaf bearing catchword " Queen of Corinth," shows it belongs rather to that play, to which its allusion to Phidias and Apelles is more appropriate. The statement of Humphrey Moseley, publisher of Folio 1, in a " postscript " preceding the " Catalogue " of plays, seems here in point—

Some Prologues and Epilogues (here inserted) were not written by the Authours of this volume ; but made by others on the Revivall of severall Playes. After the Comedies and Tragedies were wrought off, we were forced (for expedition) to send the Gentlemen's Verses to severall Printers, which was the occasion of their different Character ; but the Worke itself is one continued Letter.

Evidently this distribution among different printers and the circumstance of haste, has caused a discrepancy of more than type. The Epilogue speaks of " Our Author," and Robert Gardiner's verses " On the Dramatic Poems of Mr. John Fletcher," containing the line

Is any Lover Mad? See here *Love's Cure*,

have caused the ascription, justified in the case of *The Mad Lover*, to be

accepted of *Love's Cure* also. It was Boyle, who in *Englische Studien*, v, 95 (1882), first seriously disturbed that belief (though Fleay had previously assigned the play to Fletcher, Middleton and Rowley), and Boyle's subsequent list of verbal habits of Massinger (*Englische Studien*, x, 409-10, 1887) confirms his allotment of our Acts I, IV, and V, i, ii, to that author. Beaumont's claim, seriously weakened by its advocates' discrepancy on metrical marks, is now definitely negated by the discovery of the play's close connection with the Spanish *La Fuerza*, etc., of February, 1625; while even Fletcher, who died of the plague and was buried August 29, 1625, comes very near to a similar exclusion. His confirmed habit of "ye" for "you" is found only in II, ii (only ten in that long scene); the percentage of double-endings (15.9) in the play is far below the 60-80 per cent. of Fletcher's latest work; and the brief interval of 6-7 months between the printing of *La Fuerza* in Spain and his own death renders his participation improbable. His last year of life seems sufficiently occupied with *Rule a Wife*, licensed October 19, 1624, *The Nice Valour*, *The Chances* and *The Elder Brother*, even if some were shared, or begun by him before.¹

But for Bullen's verdict, "probably by Massinger and Middleton" I find no little confirmation. Regarding Massinger's share (Acts I, IV, V, i, ii), as sufficiently established by Boyle, I find in the remainder a prose very like Middleton's and striking resemblances of conduct to his *Blurt Master-Constable* (pr. 1602, 4°), and *The Spanish Gipsy* (at Court November 25, 1623, first pr. 1653, 4°). Great part of the action of *Blurt* passes in the house of a courtesan seducing the susceptible Fontinelle from his true love (as Malroda, Vitelli, and Clara in *Love's Cure*); Malroda calls the Alguazir *Don Blurt* in our III, i, 3, and the details of Blurt's function in II, i, correspond with our rogue's in II, i (cf. in *Blurt* "you must give my officer a groat; it's nothing to me, signior" with our Lazarillo's hit at the Alguazir, II, i (near end) "commit men nightly, offenceless, for the gain of a groat a prisoner, which your beadle seems to put up, when you share three-pence"), while our Lazarillo's hunger reproduces that of the page of the Lazarillo in *Blurt*. Our "besognios" II, i, "catzo" (*ib.*), "lay here lieger" (ambassador), II, ii, 155-56, "dag" (pistol) (*ib.*), "Cerberus" for the warder of a bawdy-house, III, ii, 102, the pun on "stitch," III, iv, 53, and

¹ See the useful list aiming at a chronological order in the Appendix to the late G. C. Macaulay's Chapter V of the *Camb. Hist. of Lit.*, Vol. vi, pp. 139-40.

the allusion to Spanish revenues from the Indies, v, iii, are all reproduced from *Blurt*, as is "beat my hilts about his coxcomb" (II, ii, cf. our II, ii, 41). These parallels, though one or two are common, are evidence of a mind consciously or unconsciously following its old tracks in handling a like subject. In *The Spanish Gipsy* we find, as in *Love's Cure*, a Spanish family feud, the death of one party, the banishment of the other (Alvarez in both plays), the wife Eugenia (*dram. pers.* list in *Spanish Gipsy*, 1653, 4°), with an infant daughter now grown up, the young man (in love with a Clara in both) burning to avenge his relative's death on the banished man whose repeal is in agitation; and in both plays the fatal duel is avoided and the feud reconciled. Detailed resemblances are Eugenia's speech, I, ii, 66, "Lucio . . . No more Posthumia now," and *Spanish Gipsy*, v, iii, "Constanza . . . No Pretiosa henceforth"; "Madrill," II, i, as in *Spanish Gipsy* throughout; and Clara's comment on the weapons, *Love's Cure*, II, ii, 124 sqq., compared with Alvarez in *Spanish Gipsy*, v, ii, 4 sqq.

Young Louis, two more trusty blades than these
Spain has not in her armoury: with this
Alvarez slew thy father; and this other, . . . etc.

and even our title may be suggested by the tag in *Spanish Gipsy*, III, ii.

No art
But love itself can cure a lovesick heart.

With regard to Fletcher, he and Massinger had collaborated in *The Spanish Curate*, produced 1622; and Dr. Greg, editing *The Elder Brother* for Bullen's Vol. II, accepted the division of Boyle and Fleay (Massinger Acts I and V; Fletcher Acts II, III and IV). Work with Massinger on *Gerardo* for *The Spanish Curate* doubtless led Fletcher to the writing of *The Maid in the Mill*, 1623, also largely founded on *Gerardo*; but for that play he called Rowley into partnership, and there seems no good ground for supposing Fletcher to have shared in *Love's Cure* at all.

THE NIGHT-WALKER

Herbert, licensing the piece for Queen Henrietta's players on May 11, 1633, called it "Fletcher's corrected by Sherley," but beyond the allusion (III, iv, 13) to Prynne's *Histriomastix*, published

1633, there seems little to distinguish Shirley precisely. Acts I and II, with their 70 and 60 per cent. of double-endings must certainly be Fletcher's, and Weber felt "strong and characteristic marks" of him in the greater portion of the piece. If I cannot attain the particularity of Mr. Oliphant, who assigns to Shirley II, iv a; IV, ii, vi; V, iia (to "*Alathe goes to Maria*"), I can at least admire his general remarks in *Englische Studien*, xv (1891), pp. 349-51, on Shirley's style. Without beating over ground where he, Boyle, and Fleay differ from each other so much, I content myself with a brief Argument of a rather difficult and over-crowded piece, which shows a succession of lively dramatic scenes rather than a clear, well-designed plot.

On the evening of the forced nuptials of Maria at her mother's house with the rich usurer Justice Algripe, her scapegrace cousin Wildbrain entraps her into an interview with a former lover, Frank Heartlove, and brings the bridegroom to witness it. Maria, swooning to find herself so compromised, is given up for dead and placed in a coffin, which is stolen that night by mistake for a chest of plate. The robber is Tom Lurcher, a gentleman ruined by Algripe, aided by his sister Alathe, the usurer's repudiated wife, who has joined her brother, disguised from him as a page, in the hope of checking his evil courses. Discovering their mistake, possibly intentional on Alathe's part (v, ii, 162), they decide to bury the coffin in the nearest churchyard. There they meet Algripe, and scare him away by placing the open coffin on one end, while Alathe from behind it reproaches him in the person of Maria's ghost; but Maria's unexpected revival puts them, too, to flight. Their next adventure is to effect a diversion, in the guise of ballad-mongers, in a quarrel between Algripe and Maria's mother, who, with her servants, is clamorously demanding her daughter's body. Admitted to the usurer's house, they occupy the servants' attention with ballad-books, and then make their way to Algripe, whom they bind and gag while they rifle his desk, Lurcher (beside money and jewels) recovering the mortgage of his land, and Alathe (unnoticed by him) her marriage-contract. Disguised, next, as a constable, Lurcher inveigles Algripe, on pretence of capturing the robbers, to a hovel in the suburbs; where he is terrified by a masque of Furies, followed by a vision of Alathe in the person of an angel who exhorts him to repentance. The same night the pair retaliate on Wildbrain, who, expelled from his aunt's house, has contrived to ingratiate himself with and make spoil of Lurcher's mistress, by stealing the clothes (with the newly-acquired rings, chain, and money) which Wildbrain has laid aside for a bell-ringing match.

Meantime Maria, appearing first in her shroud as a spirit, has been able to arrest a duel between Wildbrain and her lover Heartlove (III, ii); and afterwards (III, v) by talking a broken gibberish, to pass herself off on her mother as the Welsh niece of her old nurse. Her strong resemblance

to his lost love arouses a powerful interest in Heartlove; her identity gradually declares itself; and the obstacle to the lovers' union is finally removed by Alathe, who in the presence of the repentant Algripe produces the evidence of his previous marriage to herself. The comic element is reinforced by the old lady's coachman Toby, a stout adherent of Wildbrain, who shares in the bell-ringing and suffers a like robbery of his clothes. The scapegrace is ultimately forgiven by his aunt.

One little point in the text has baffled even Dyce. Maria in her Welsh character begins a speech with "Haleggs!" (III, vi, 54): it is nothing more than her garbled repetition of Heartlove's immediately preceding word "*di-alect*" as her immediately following "What does her speak hard 'urds to her" sufficiently shows.—Mistress Newlove's part seems to have suffered by some retrenchment of Wildbrain's.

THE WOMAN'S PRIZE OR THE TAMER TAMED

Herbert's Office-Book has recorded a performance of Shakespeare's *Taming*, before royalty on November 26, 1633, followed by "*The Tamer Tamed*, made by Fletcher" on November 28. Some lengthy further remarks of Herbert prove the latter piece then a play of the King's men; and that "upon complaints of foule and offensive matters conteyned therein" he had stopped their acting of it at the Blackfriars on the preceding October 18, and had immediately after purged the text of this "ould play" of "oaths, prophaneſſe, and ribaldrye." Weber was probably right in supposing the complainants Puritans, who might take offence at II, ii, v, vi and III, ii: but the Stationer's letter "to the Readers" prefixed to the folio of 1647 assures them: "But now you have both All that was Acted, and all that was not; even the perfect full Originalls without the least mutilation."

Since Herbert has no earlier mention of it, we get May 14, 1622, the date when his entries begin, as a downward limit for the play's first production. Fleay in 1891 argued from the absence of an actor-list that it was not originally a play of the King's men, with whom Fletcher was connected from 1616-1625, but one of Lady Elizabeth's company, *c.* 1615. Dr. Thorndike, however, reasonably argued that regular connection with one company need not preclude a dramatist from occasionally placing a play with another¹

¹ *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher*, 1901, pp. 11-13.

If a King's men play, Fleay would date it in 1612, but doubts if at that date they would have produced a burlesque of a Shakespeare piece. To me it seems that neither the King's men nor Shakespeare would feel any grievance; for even in 1633 it seems to have involved a parallel revival of Shakespeare's piece, though the royal judgment seems to have preferred Fletcher's. But the demand of some critics for an early date seems largely due to the allusions to the siege of Ostend (1601-4), in I, iii, 87, and to the assassination of the Prince of Orange (July 10, 1584), in II, ii, 44, the latter of which quite contradicts the notion that such allusions in plays must always be "topical" and of quite recent reference. In fact allusion to matters so famous can prove nothing more than subsequence, though the near intervention of some dated document about them might alter the case. Equally I see no need to connect our play with several others on conjugal difference near the beginning of the century: this matter is perennial, coeval with the race. Oliphant in his recent book¹ enumerates some of these, and champions an early date, but contents himself with 1607 and a revision in 1610. To me these faint connections by reminiscence are as nothing in face of the plain evidence of the verse-tests, especially those habits followed almost unconsciously by the writer. Of these none are more significant for Fletcher than the double-ending and the run-on line. Boyle stated his practice thus:

Double endings.	Run-on lines.
35-44 per cent. (early work).	14-20 per cent. (early work).
60-75 per cent. (late work).	10 per cent. (late work).

Editing this play in 1906, I found:

Total of verse-lines in the play	2068.
Double endings	1667, or about 80 per cent.
Run-on lines	258, or 8 per cent.

I should not, however, venture a more precise date than 1618-22, though, as Dr. Thorndike urges that these years are already full of work, it may possibly be 1617.

The German scholar Rapp is said to have found a parallel between Fletcher's Acts I and II, and the *Lysistrata* of Aristophanes, where the Athenian wives under her leadership agree to deny their husbands marriage-rights until they stop the war with Sparta.

¹ *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*, Clarendon Press, 1927, pp. 153-54.

Indeed, the Greek piece corresponds closely with ours in the women barricading themselves into the Acropolis, drenching their opponents with water, weakness for liquor, the κάλυμμα worn by Lysistrata (cf. the hood of our II, vi, 62, 75), Cinesias confessing that rebellion only enhances Myrrhina's attraction (II. 385-88), the men's final acceptance of their conditions, and the festive close. Aldus had printed nine plays of Aristophanes in 1498: yet despite a Greek predilection visible in some of Fletcher's plays it does not seem probable that he read Greek, though he might hear so much as the above from Ben Jonson, living till 1636. Köppel suggested that Maria's country-allies might be taken from the Spartan (and Boeotian) confederates of Lysistrata, and reminded us that *Mery Tales*, *Wittie Questions*, etc., 1567, has one "Of him that feyned hym selfe dead, to prove what his wyfe wolde do" (as does Petruchio in v, iv). Fletcher borrows the names Petruchio, Bianca, and Tranio, and provides his heroine with a gentler sister, Livia, who develops shrewish temper. Other little points are Petruchio's confident wager in I, iii, 1-5 and Maria's witty parody of his original in IV, v, 162-5. "One meal a week will serve you, and one suit. . . . The poorer and the baser you appear, The more you look through still," recalling "So honour peereth in the meanest habit." But Fletcher's independence appears in representing Petruchio's former married life as a ceaseless dread lest Katharine should get the upper hand, I, i, 31-8; III, ii, 204-16; there is also the added interest of Rowland's wager with Tranio; and a considerable element of definite burlesque, e.g., Maria's vow, I, ii, 106 ff.; the fortification, I, iii, 47-93; the conference between Livia and the besieged, II, ii; Jacques in II, iv, 50 sqq.; the colloquy on the terms, II, vi, 87-115; and brief return to the tone at the beginning of IV, ii.

THE NOBLE GENTLEMAN

This play, nearly reproduced in Dufey's *Three Dukes of Dunstable*, 1688, was licensed by Herbert at the Blackfriars on February 3, 1625-26, Fletcher having died of the plague near the end of August, 1625. The mixed character of its versification quite forbids us to regard it as a late work of Fletcher's, and Oliphant's book of 1927, pp. 183-201 (and Chronological Survey), predicates a first version by Beaumont and Fletcher for Paul's Boys, 1606, a second by Fletcher for Lady Elizabeth's men, 1613, and a third as entered

by Herbert for the King's men in February, 1626. Now the verse in the larger part is like Fletcher's, but nowhere that of his latest period, for which the double-endings here are far too few and the run-on lines too many. Moreover, Malone (Boswell's ed., iii, 225) assures us from Herbert's list that Fletcher produced eleven new plays (including this) in the last four years of his life. That is surely too large an output for the time : some of these may have been produced before, and the posthumous date of the King's men performance itself argues that it was not a new work but a revival, with changes by some other playwright requiring a fresh licence. Conjugal contest is rather a favourite subject with Fletcher, e.g. *Rule a Wife*, 1624, *The Woman's Prize*, 1618-22, and might occur early or late : the same may be said of mock elevation, like Castruccio's in *The Double Marriage*, c. 1620 ; while rapid inflation of ambition like Jaques' and Clerimont's in this play is handled in Syphax of *The Mad Lover*, iv, iii (1615-18). Another feature common to our piece, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, ? 1612, and *The Mad Lover* is insanity as the result of unfortunate love, extreme in the two former, mild in Memnon, in which play, as in this, there is recourse to the superstition " the lion will not touch the true prince." An original for the love-crazed Goaler's Daughter of the *Kinsmen* is probably to be found in Ophelia ; and it is difficult to deny suggestion for Shatillion and his love in the actual circumstances of the perfectly sane *Hamlet*, his nearness to the crown, the actual royal machinations to which he is exposed, and the lament of Ophelia over his supposed madness (iii, i, 158) as of Shatillion's mistress here :

There he goes
That was the fairest hope the French court bred,
The worthiest and the sweetest-temper'd spirit,
The truest and the valiantest, the best of judgment,
Till most unhappy I sever'd those virtues (i, iii, 31-35).

There is a less obvious yet equally close relation of Chatillion to Don Quixote, in his chivalrous character and the readiness with which he elevates an ordinary or comic into a heroic situation, e.g., his effort to save Jaques in iv, iii, his solemn championship of the royal cause against Jaques and Marine in v, i, 271 sqq., and his devotion to his love—

I know my duty : next unto my king,
I am to kneel to you (v, i, 348)

his whole part forming an excellent example of pathos on the very borders of farce which has been well noted among Fletcher's general marks. There is further the later share of simple Jaques in Marine's delusion (III, i), reminding one of the subtle effect of his master's craze on the good sense of honest Sancho Panza. The First Part of Cervantes' work, issued in Spain in 1605, was translated into English by Thomas Shelton in 1612; and this date, while probably negating Oliphant's first date for the play (1606), would harmonise well with his second (1613), and still allow of Beaumont's collaboration, which the verse seems to require. My date then would be 1613-16.

But of other and later work in it the signs are abundant—many unfinished lines, some characters unnamed, sudden intrusion of rhyme-tags often coinciding with speeches incoherent or inconsistent, e.g., Madam Marine's in II, i, 203-16; III, ii, 99-106; iv. 14-20; and Clerimont, v, i, 127-36. The sympathy Madame Marine evinces for Chatillion and his love in III, ii, 113-50; v, i, 309, 440-41, seems quite inconsistent with her otherwise selfish and heartless character, and is probably a lame attempt to conciliate favour for her before the close—at least it could not escape the audience that the "perfect end" which her closing speech claims to have reached is, in reality, the speedy ruin of her husband and herself. As to the reviser in 1626, I have no strong conviction. Massinger or Rowley have been suggested; but the clusters of rhyme (though Tourneur has them) and occasional abruptness, especially at the end, remind me rather of Middleton, a fine poet on occasion (e.g., *The Changeling*), but with an inadequate sense of art.

35).

Chatillion
ness with
ation, e.g.,
ship of the
, and his

SOME PROBLEMS IN THE CHRONOLOGY OF MILTON'S EARLY POEMS

BY W. R. PARKER

WHEN Milton wrote :

How soon hath time the subtle thief of youth,
Stoln on his wing my three and twentieth year !

exactly how old was he ? This poem is included in an undated letter in the 'Trinity MS., and Milton speaks of it as composed "some while since." In the two editions of the minor poems published in his lifetime the sonnet is given no title—merely the number, VII. In the next three editions it remained title-less. The edition printed for Tonson in 1713, however, gave the sonnet the title, *On his being arriv'd to his 23^d Year*. By "23^d Year" this editor undoubtedly meant "age of 23." But later editors adopted the invented title, until, in 1751, it was changed to *On his being arriv'd to the age of 23*. Bishop Newton, in his edition of the following year, accepted the new title without comment. Warton reprinted Newton's title, but "explained": "In Milton, Time . . . brings on his wing, in his flight, the poet's twenty third year."

Now this contradiction is proof of the ambiguity which usage had given the phrase ; Milton was aged twenty-three—and yet beginning his "twenty-third year." These editors were unable to date Milton's poem correctly because they were guilty of the same carelessness as Milton himself. Todd not only adopted Warton's title but also quoted his comment with apparent approval. Masson used the title, *On his being arrived at the age of 23*, attributed it to Milton,¹ and made the sonnet number two instead of seven. Pattison accepted Masson's numbering, headed the sonnet, "Dec. 1631. Æt. 23," and gave it three different titles in various portions of his edition. Smart corrected Masson's meddling with the proper order, but seemed to accept the previous interpretations of the date.

¹ In the *Life*, i. 246 n.

Although so many editors, like Warton, have thought "it expedient to alter or enlarge Milton's own titles, which seemed to want fulness or precision,"¹ no one of them has done so in the light of a well-known peculiarity of the poet. When Milton wrote "Anno ætatis 17," he meant, not "in his seventeenth year of age," but always "at the age of seventeen." With this phrase he dated eight of his Latin and two of his English poems, and in most instances we are able to prove his memory accurate. It is clear that, in Latin at least, he meant "at the age of" when he wrote "in the year of age."

But can we prove that Milton meant "age of twenty-three" when he wrote, in English, "three and twentieth year"? In the *History of Britain* he cites Asser as his authority for his facts about the death of Alfred; and according to Milton, Alfred "ended his daies in the year 900. the 51. of his Age."² Asser writes: "anno vero ætatis suæ 51."³ Remembering Milton's usual interpretation of "anno ætatis 51," we can see that "51st year of age" likewise meant to him "aged 51." A less confusing illustration, however, is to be found a few pages later in the *History*. "This year," he writes, "dy'd *Swarling* a Monk of *Croyland*, the 142. year of his Age, and another soon after him in the 115th."⁴ His authority for this statement is given in the margin as "*Ingulf*," and in the latter's *Historia* we read:

Anno proxime sequente obiit dominus *Swarlingus* completis annis vitæ suæ 142. . . Tandem anno proximo vltimus omnium obiit Dominus *Turgarus* venerabilis senex completis annis vitæ suæ 115.⁵

It is certain, then, that Milton made this particular error in English as well as in Latin. Is there further reason for believing that he made it in the sonnet *How soon hath time*? In the Trinity MS. letter he wrote:

Yet that you may see that I am something suspicious of my self and do take notice of a certain belatedness in me, I am the bolder to send you some of my nightward thoughts some while since.

These "nightward thoughts" complain that "my late spring no bud or blossom shew'th." In December, 1631, when Milton

¹ 1785 ed., p. xxiv.

² 1670 ed., p. 212; Bohn, v. 325.

³ 1603 ed., p. 21.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 235; Bohn, v. 341.

⁵ 1605 ed., p. 887.

became twenty-three, he was still a student at Cambridge. A sonnet written then would be almost contemporary with the confident, enthusiastic *Seventh Prolusion*; would be the work of a man who had written the lines *On Shakespeare* and knew that they would appear, within a few months, in the forthcoming *Second Folio*; would be the complaint of one who had recently composed the lovely epitaph on the Marchioness of Winchester and two light-hearted poems on Hobson. It would be the words of a poet barely two years distant from the experience of the *Nativity Ode*, and almost certainly with six other sonnets immediately behind him. Admittedly Sonnet VII *might* have been written by such a person; but is it, once we realize that the date is uncertain, altogether likely?

In December, 1632, when Milton became twenty-four, he had spent five months at Horton, away from Cambridge, away from all his former friends. So far as we have any positive knowledge, he had written no poetry for twenty whole months. Twenty-four, unlike twenty-three, suggests the completion of a cycle. There are twenty-four hours in a day; the Marchioness of Winchester had lived "Summers three times eight save one."

Faced with this much evidence, we cannot, I think, avoid the conclusion that the sonnet was written in December, 1632. And once we accept this inference, a number of difficulties begin to resolve themselves. Editors have always tried to date the "Letter to an Unknown Friend" by the sonnet which is a part of it; and, doing so, they have usually found themselves in trouble, for the letter follows *Arcades* in the MS. and is also preceded by three drafts of *At a Solemn Music*. In his edition of the *Poetical Works*, Masson gives the letter the date 1633 (when Milton was twenty-four) and is thus forced to interpret "some while since" as equivalent to nearly two years.¹ In the *Life*, on the other hand, he declares that the letter "must have been written in December, 1631, or in the early part of 1631-2."² Grierson, suspicious of the first date (but ignoring the second), quite justly objects that

it would surely be impertinent to say to an elderly friend who rebuked me for apparently idling and drifting that I would show him a sonnet I had written on that two years before. "Some time since" can hardly cover more than a few months.³

¹ *Op. cit.*, i. 207.

² *Ibid.*, 244.

³ *Poems*, i. p. xiv.

Grierson is driven by his own good logic, therefore, to giving 1632, or even 1630, as a date for *Arcades*, and he skilfully substantiates his inference.

But the letter was certainly written after Milton's withdrawal to Horton, or there would be little point in the references to "studious retirement," "a manner of living much disregarded, & discountenanced," "affected solitariness," and "prolonged obscurity." A Cambridge student, deep in all the work in preparation for his degree, would hardly speak thus of his life. There would be no "murmurs of freinds scandals taken & such like," nor would anyone accuse him of giving "up my selfe to dreame away my yeares." His "tardie moving" begins when he leaves the academic world, "cutts himselfe off from all action," and suffers a "prolonged obscurity" that he may prepare himself for great achievement. Only after he had graduated from the University would he talk of "entring into some credible employment" and building up "a house & family of his owne."

The letter was written, not only after Milton's graduation on July 3, 1632, but also some time after he had been in residence at Horton. This is clear from the tone of the defence and from the writer's explicit statement that his plan had "held out thus long against so strong opposition on the other side of every kind." Man's "potent inclination" to marry and settle down—one of the things against which he had "held out thus long"—would scarcely have been possible before July, 1632. As the sonnet, clearly written on or immediately following a birthday, comes in "not altogether unfity" and was composed "some while since," we have no choice but to put the letter in 1633 and the poem in December, 1632.

With this much established, we are in a position to consider the dates of many additional poems. If we interpret Milton's intentions fairly, and if we make allowances for normal lapses in memory, we may look to the author himself for much assistance. Of the eighty-seven shorter poems which Milton published in his lifetime, thirty-four are specifically dated, and others date themselves by the events to which they refer. More important, there is evident in both the 1645 and 1673 editions a conscious attempt to arrange the poems in chronological order. In the part of the book devoted to Latin and Greek verses this is particularly noticeable. There are five distinct sections—elegies, epigrams, *sylva*, Greek verses, and Latin tributes; and within each of these five sections almost all the

poems are in exact order of composition. In the Errata to the 1673 edition Milton states that the *Vacation Exercise*, which there follows the translation from Horace, "should have come" after the *Fair Infant* elegy. The words "should have come" are significant, for they indicate that the author was equally concerned about the arrangement of all the English poems.

The poems are in order, however, *only within their respective groups*. Even then, for artistic reasons Milton felt it occasionally necessary to disturb the order, as in the case of the *Elegia Septima*. Here, however, he calls attention to the date; and if we turn to the English poems, we shall find that this was his general practice. He carefully dates all his translations of Psalms, because Psalms 80-88 (1648) were done before Psalms 1-8 (1653) and in his book he wants them arranged in proper order. Psalms 114 and 136, on the other hand, are dated and put in a different section, because they were youthful exercises and inferior. Similarly, for obvious reasons, the longer and more impressive *Comus* is put last in the pastoral group, but both *Comus* (1634) and *Lycidas* (1637) are dated. The book opens with the *Nativity Ode* (1629), but to distinguish it from the group which follows, Milton supplies dates for it and for the next three poems. The opening lines of *The Passion* (undated) make it very clear where that poem belongs in relation to the Ode and to the entire group.

A poet, unless he dates his work at the time of composition, is likely to forget the exact month in which any particular piece was written. It is remarkable enough if, after a lapse of fourteen or more years, he can recall the exact year. We must not be led into doubting Milton's intention, therefore, if the epitaph of a woman who died in April, 1631, precedes two poems on a man who died four months earlier¹ or another poem carefully dated 1630. The lines on Shakespeare, Hobson, and the Marchioness of Winchester were all probably written in what we now call 1631, though the first three poems might well have been written in Milton's 1630, which ended on March 25, 1631. It is unfair to expect the poet, in 1645, to remember that Thomas Hobson died three months and fifteen days before Jane Paulet, when we do not know that he ever spoke a word to either of them.

¹ Why must we infer that Milton wrote his humorous verses on the Cambridge carrier within a month of the man's death? The very lightness of their tone suggests that they were composed some time later—perhaps, as the order implies, in May or June, 1631.

Let us now consider the English poems of the 1673 edition, leaving them in the order in which Milton published them, but dividing them into groups. First comes the *Nativity Ode*, which, as we have already seen, stands alone. Then follows a group of eight religious or serious poems, employing a variety of metres :

- (2-3) Paraphrases of Psalms : " at fifteen years old " (1624)
- (4) *Fair Infant* elegy : " Anno ætatis 17 " (1625-6)
- (5) *At a Vacation Exercise* : " Anno ætatis 19 " (1628)
- (6) *The Passion* : dated by the *Nativity Ode* (1630)
- (7) *On Time*
- (8) *Upon the Circumcision*
- (9) *At a Solemn Music*

In this list only three dates have been unknown. But *At a Solemn Music* was written between *Arcades* and the letter in the Trinity MS., and almost certainly after Sonnet VII, which is transcribed but not composed in the MS. It is reasonable to place it, then, early in 1633. *On Time* and *Upon the Circumcision* precede *At a Solemn Music* in the 1673 edition. That this was the correct order may be inferred from the fact that, like the sonnet, they are transcribed, not composed, in the MS. As the sonnet laments the absence of " bud or blossom," it seems probable that these two poems were an attempt to remedy the situation. *On Time* might even have been suggested by *How soon hath time* (in December, 1632); and *Upon the Circumcision* might have been written on January 1, 1633, the appropriate day in the Church calendar. Both poems are in the strongly religious mood of the sonnet.

The second English group in the book corresponds roughly to the *Sylvæ* or Miscellanies in the Latin section. And like the Latin poems, they are distinguished from the first group as much by form as by matter. Every one of the seven poems is in riming couplets.

- (10) *On the Marchioness of Winchester* (1631)
- (11) *Song : On May Morning*
- (12) *On Shakespeare* (1630-31)
- (13-14) *On Hobson* (1631)
- (15-16) *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*

In this group there are likewise three dates that have been unknown. There is no good reason, however, for excluding the " Song " from the time-group to which it plainly belongs. *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*, moreover, must have been written after 1630 and, I think, before 1633. They do not occur in the Trinity MS.

Tillyard has shown that they were probably derived from Milton's *First Prolusion*, and certainly for a university audience. I rather doubt whether Milton would have praised the plays of Ben Jonson immediately after his good friend, Alexander Gill, had publicly damned Jonson as a playwright (late in 1632)¹ and engaged in a quarrel as a result. There is a certain amount of hesitation implied in these twin poems which suggests the problem resolved in the *Seventh Prolusion* (early in 1632), Sonnet VII, and the letter. We know from the *Seventh Prolusion* that in 1631 Milton had spent a happy summer in the country. I incline, therefore, to this year as a date for *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*, rather than the year when independent study began in earnest and Milton grieved at the absence of "bud or blossom." However more mature these poems may seem in execution, their rhythm is the rhythm of the lovely Epitaph *On the Marchioness of Winchester*, and the mood of one is the mood of *On Hobson* and *On May Morning*. *Il Penseroso* becomes, then, a lyric harbinger of *How soon hath time*, *On Time*, and *At a Solemn Music*.

Following the sonnets in the 1673 edition are three poems which Milton must have found very difficult to classify :

- (37) Translation of the Fifth Ode of Horace
- (4) *At a Vacation Exercise* : "Anno ætatis 19"
- (38) *On the New Forcers of Conscience*

After these had been set up in type, he wanted to move the *Vacation Exercise* to the first group, probably on the strength of its solemnity and references to writing in English. He might also have added *On the New Forcers of Conscience* to the sonnet group (as he had the *Canzone*), but that would have left the translation awkwardly alone. It is easy to see why he did not include the translation in any of the previous groups ; it plainly does not belong there. It is not easy, however, to understand why editors have insisted on assigning it to the period after 1645. Against the usual argument that it does not appear in the first edition, the *Fair Infant* elegy and *Vacation Exercise* are a sufficient answer. Moreover, both the nature of the poem and its position in the group are evidence of an earlier date. The translation, probably a school exercise, is a unique example of Milton's putting Latin 'frivolous' verse into English. In 1626, however, he was reading Horace and writing elegies in Horatian

¹ See Masson, *Life*, i. 448-9.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF MILTON'S EARLY POEMS 283

metres. Until December, 1629, he seemed fond of Horace as a model, but in the *Elegia Sexta* he bade him a tolerant, though firm, farewell. In 1648 and 1653 he is engaged in translating Psalms—a far cry from the Fifth Ode. In the group to which it belongs, the translation is followed by a poem written in 1628. The fact that he wished to move the latter to a different group does not affect our inference that, in the original group, the poems were in order of composition. The translation belongs to the period before 1628.

In the group of pastoral poems :

- (39) *Arcades*
- (40) *Lycidas* : 1637
- (41) *Comus* : 1634

only the first is undated. But here again we are helped by the Trinity MS. and Sonnet VII. *Arcades* may not actually have been "composed" in the MS., yet when Milton started writing out this "Part of a maske," he had apparently not decided on a title. Certainly he was dissatisfied with the first two lines ; he scratched them out, wrote down a title and explanatory note, and started afresh. In the course of this "transcription" of a 109-line poem, there are at least twenty corrections made. Clearly *Arcades* had not been finally "composed" before it was written into the MS. book. It is significant that the four pages immediately following are used purely for composition—not transcription. The *Part of a maske* must, therefore, have been put in its final form before *At a Solemn Music* and the letter, but probably after *How soon hath time*. If it had been written, as Grierson suggests, in 1630 (the plague year), we should have to believe that Milton laid aside a MS. book he had bought for composition, and wrote about seventeen poems elsewhere. In April of 1631, the Earl of Castlehaven, son-in-law of the Countess of Derby, was executed. And at the end of 1632 Milton lamented that his "late spring no bud or blossom shew'th." *Arcades* was probably written early in 1633. It is the "bud" of which *Comus*, written the following year, is the full and lovely flowering.

DRYDEN AS HISTORIOGRAPHER-ROYAL: THE
AUTHORSHIP OF HIS MAJESTIES
DECLARATION DEFENDED, 1681

BY ROSWELL G. HAM

THE dignified but unremunerative position of Poet Laureate came to Dryden six days after the death of D'Avenant in 1668.¹ It was not, however, until August 18, 1670, that Charles in a joint patent designated him Historiographer-Royal as well, and "for his great Witt and elegant Style in Verse & prose" granted him

the rights priviledges benefitts and advantages, therevnto belonging as fully and amply as Sir Geoffery Chaucer knight Sir john Gower knight john Leland Esquire William Camden Esquire Benjamin johnson Esquire james Howell Esquire Sir William Davenant knight or any other person or persons haveing or exercising the place or employment of Poet Laureat or historiographer or either of them in the time of our Royall progenitors.²

The list is a singular medley, out of which those names appertaining to the laureateship and its functions have been sufficiently discussed. But to the post of Historiographer-Royal, or General, as it was occasionally termed, has been directed little attention, and virtually none at all to its bearing upon John Dryden. He was appointed, we read, for his excellency as much in prose as in verse, was paid the comfortable stipend of £200 a year—though with no designated part of the salary depending upon the post of historiographer³—and presumably was active in the exercise of his duties. But exactly what were they? Could we but answer that question, it might be possible to subdivide in a more satisfactory fashion his various political and literary activities, and in addition, begin to identify, perhaps, a considerable body of anonymous prose tracts as issuing from his hand.

¹ E. K. Broadus, *The Laureateship*, Oxford, 1921, p. 60.

² "Chaucer, Dryden and the Laureateship," a note by Eleanore Boswell, *R.E.S.*, vii, 27, 338.

³ L. I. Bredvold, "Notes on John Dryden's Pension," *Modern Philology*, xxi, 268-9.

First, as to the antiquity of the post, we may note that, among the historians mentioned in the patent, Leland appears to have been appointed King's antiquary, without, however, either predecessor or follower. Camden was royally esteemed, given great encouragement, and made Clarenceux king-of-arms; but so far as discovered he was never officially designated the Royal historiographer.¹ On the other hand, a certain Bernard Andreas, to whom the patent makes no allusion, under Henry VIII combined the title as did Dryden with that of Poet Laureate.² One explanation of the reappearance of the Historiographer, after the lapse of so many years, is very likely to be found somewhere in the travels of Charles II, particularly in France. "C'est à la fin du XVI^e siècle qu'apparaît le titre officiel d'historiographe."³ The list of French historiographers had been distinguished by the names of Pierre Pascal and the earlier Balzac; it was to have in its line Boileau, Racine, and Voltaire. From this Gallic precedent very likely it was that James Howell argued for his designation to the post in 1661. "Among the prudentest and best policed nations," said he, "there is a Minister of State appointed and qualified with the title of Historiographer Generall."⁴ Whether this was his original suggestion or that of Charles himself, Howell received the appointment, and apparently so much esteemed it as a climax to his career that upon his tombstone in the Temple Church he was noted *Regius Historiographus*, with the pertinent addition, *in Anglia primus*.⁵

What we may know, then, concerning the requirements of the office, as held by John Dryden, is to be deduced from its character under Howell; and happily with him there enter no complexities of the laureateship. In one place, he writes of himself as "a free historian"; and, indeed, his published works, especially those issued immediately upon his appointment, were of such a character. Tractarian and in general the political apologetics for royalty, they utilized history as a justification of theory. Thus among the *Twelve Treatises*, published in 1661 over his new title of "His Majesties Historiographer Royal" are to be found the following suggestive captions: *His Majesties Royal Declaration, Sway of the Sword, and Vindication of his Majesty*. Later, 1664, he published *A Discours*

¹ D.N.B. Articles: Camden, Leland.

² Broadus, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

³ *Nouveau Larousse Illustré*. Article: historiographe.

⁴ Broadus, p. 62.

⁵ *Notes and Queries*, clv, 445.

of *Dunkirk with some Reflexes upon the late surrender thereof and A Discourse Concerning the Precedency of Kings*.¹ No single title in the lot is history in our accepted sense of the word.

With this background in mind we may turn our attention to Dryden. In the period of Dryden's incumbency, 1670-88, there is an apparent lacuna of no tractarian or historical activity for a full decade after appointment, unless we may consider his tragedy of *Amboyna*, 1673, as a royally inspired attack upon the Dutch. But in the same area no title seems any more definitely to partake of the laureate's function. It is not until 1680 that we have a clear indication that his post of historiographer was anything more than a sinecure. In that year a correspondent of November 27 startles us by his allusion to the purchase of "that History of Dryden's".² To what work this unnoted and chance remark may refer remains unsettled, for in the accepted canon of the poet-historian there is no clear title in point. Somewhat questionably it may have been the *Annus Mirabilis* or *Amboyna*, though each seems a bit too far removed in time and character to be acceptable. Probabilities point either to a lost or to an unidentified work.

Looking over the bibliography of Dryden, we may note certain titles as of the same general character as those of Howell. The active years naturally fall during the stormy 'eighties, a period of immense tractarian ferment. Quite definitely both the play of *The Duke of Guise*, 1683, and its elaborate *Vindication*, of the same year, were in the correct mode. Likewise Maimbourg's *History of the League*, "translated into English by His Majesty's Command by Mr. Dryden," 1684, carries on the tradition. Most important to us are the long political disquisitions that preface and conclude the work. *A Defence of the Papers Written by the late King of Blessed Memory, and Duchess of York*, 1686, "by authority," and a translation of *The Life of St. Francis Xavier*, 1688, drew this particular activity to a conclusion. But what of *Absalom and Achitophel*, *The Medal*, and *The Hind and the Panther*? What of certain of his political prologues and epilogues? From contemporary gossip we know that several of these were inspired by royal command. They are argumentative or apologetic in character. The fact that they are also great poetry need not conceal their essential kinship to the work of both Dryden and Howell in a more prosaic field. Finally,

¹ W. A. Vann, *Notes on the Writings of James Howell*, *passim*.

² *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 12 Rpt., App., pt. vii, p. 175.

it is probable that Dryden in these years either supervised or composed a number of the tracts published "by Royal Command." Their identification, while tantalizing, is not impossible.

In this connection new evidence has recently been published corroborative of Dryden's activity as historiographer, with some considerable illumination as to his duties. Until the appearance in 1933 of the second volume of Winston Churchill's study of Marlborough it had remained unobserved that Dryden was closely identified with an unpublished narrative of the early years of James II. Some allusion to this work had appeared in the writings of Charles James Fox, but the latter had curiously failed to identify its editor. Thus he remarked that:

There were in the Scotch College [Paris] two distinct manuscripts, one in James's own hand, consisting of papers of different sizes bound up together, the other a sort of historical narrative, compiled from the former. The narrative was *said* to have been revised and corrected, as to style, by Dryden the poet, (meaning probably Charles Dryden, the great poet's son) and it was not known in the College whether it was drawn up in James's life, or by the direction of his son, the Pretender.¹

That it was not Charles but John Dryden, his father, who edited this narrative would appear conclusive from a letter dated 1740, from Mr. Thomas Inesse (or Inese), one-time principal of the Scots College. Inesse remarked that to the adaptation of James's *Memoires* there was appended a note, in the hand of his predecessor, to this effect:

[Transcribed in 3 volumes in 4° from the Kings original Memoires by M. Dryden the famous Poet, in the year 1686, and afterwards revised by his Majesty, and in Severall places corrected in his own hand.]

He thus comments:

There are besides some other Markes upon this Copy of Mr. Dryden by which it would appear that A.D. 1686 when it was made it was making ready for the Press and probably it had been published, if the unhappy Revolution had not soon after fallen out.

This Copy is indeed very valuable in itself being made under his late Majesty's eye, and no doubt all the differences in it from the Original have been made by H. Ms. directions or by himself. . . .²

¹ C. J. Fox, *A History of the Early Part of the Reign of James the Second*, London, 1808, p. xx. Quoted by Churchill.

² Winston S. Churchill, *Marlborough, His Life and Times*, New York, 1933, II, 61. Without offering a final conclusion, I may suggest that Clarke's edition of *The Life of James the Second*, London, 1816, gives us substantially the work of Dryden in Part I of the biography, detailing the events before 1660. The problem is, however, highly involved and will require additional study.

Whether the text in Dryden's hand was subsequently lost is left in some obscurity. In any event we have here a dim sketch of Dryden pursuing his appointed task, at times under the closest supervision of the King, at others acting in the capacity of what we should now term "His Majesty's Ghost-writer."

We approach at this point the specific problem of a tractarian work variously assigned and denied the authorship of the historian-grapher. The twenty-page pamphlet entitled *His Majesties Declaration Defended*, 1681,¹ was, with two other works assigned to him, easily dismissed by Mr. Henry B. Wheatley in his bibliography of the poet. He remarked that "There does not seem to be any evidence for the attribution of these treatises to Dryden." But it was not so simple. For Mr. Percy J. Dobell, in his *John Dryden, Bibliographical Memoranda*,² observed that he had in his possession a copy with the contemporary manuscript notation, "Written by Mr. John Dryden." These early attributions, however, have been found notoriously unreliable, if for nothing else than the fact that anonymous works by force of gravity tend to be attracted to the greatest contemporary names. And so it might rest.

But we must note the date of its appearance—some five or six months before the publication of *Absalom and Achitophel*, Pt. I. The latter may have been undertaken at the hint of Charles some time in February or March, 1680-1.³ It was shortly afterwards, May 26, 1681, that *The Observer* discussed the whiggish *Letter from a Person of Quality*—the immediate provocation of our pamphlet—"as one of the most daring papers yet come to light"; and again, on June 22, mentions *His Majesties Declaration Defended* as an "Answer to that Cursed Letter you and I were talking of tother day; and an Excellent Piece." Thus, apparently falling between the two dates, its publication would easily adjust itself to the time scheme of Dryden's activity, actually during the composition of his poetic masterpiece. Its title is interesting, as a kind of reminiscence of Howell's similar activity with *His Majesties Declaration*. All

¹ *His Majesties / DECLARATION / DEFENDED : / In a LETTER to a Friend. / BEING AN / ANSWER / TO A / Seditious Pamphlet, / CALLED / A LETTER from a Person of Quality / to his Friend : / CONCERNING / The King's late Declaration touching the Reasons / which moved him to Dissolve / THE TWO LAST / PARLIAMENTS / AT / WESTMINSTER and OXFORD. / LONDON : / Printed for T. Davies, 1681. / Collation : Folio, 20 pp. consisting of 1-2 t-p, verso blank; 3-20 text. Signatures, beginning with p. 3 are A2, 2 leaves; B-D in 2's; E, 1 leaf; preceded by one leaf bearing title-page. (Yale Library.)*

² Pp. 17-18.

³ Cf. Malone, *Prose Works of John Dryden*, I, i, 141-142.

this, however, is inconclusive evidence, except to show that the piece might by time and character have issued from the King's Historiographer.

More immediately to the point is a new bit of external evidence recently discovered in Echard's *History of England*. The quotation is so much to the point of our discussion that I venture to reprint it almost in full. The King's *Declaration* itself came after the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament : ¹

On the same Day [remarks Echard] it was Order'd by his Majesty in Council, *That the said Declaration be forthwith Printed and Publish'd, and Read in all Churches and Chappels throughout this Kingdom* ; which for the most part was Cheerfully obey'd, and with remarkable Success. To weaken the natural Effects of a Thing so Popular, there came out two celebrated Pieces, the First Entitled, *A Just and Modest Vindication of the Proceedings of the two last Parliaments*, ascrib'd to the ingenious Pen of Sir William Jones. . . . The second Piece was call'd *A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend*,² concerning his Majesty's late Declaration, &c. the Author of which very freely tells us, 'That there never was more Occasion for a Parliament, than at the Opening of the last, held at Westminster ; never had People juster Fears, nor of weightier Consideration, to be secured against ; never were our *Liberties and Properties* more in Danger ; nor the *Protestant Religion* more expos'd to an utter Extirpation both at Home and Abroad.' Speaking of the Person of the King, he informs us, 'In his *Private Capacity* as a Man, he can only Eat and Drink, and perform some other Acts of Nature ; but that all his Actings without Himself, are only as a King, and in his *Politick Capacity* he ought not to Marry, Love, Hate, make War, Friendship or Peace, but as King, and agreeable to the People, and their Interest he governs.' And as to the Lords rejecting Fitz-Harris's Impeachment, he says *Their Votes wou'd not have born a Conference*. This Author was soon after lash'd by the Satyrical Pen of Mr. John Dryden, who undertook to expose the Exorbitancies of Him and his Friends, and to vindicate the Honour and Dignity of the House of Lords, as to the Case of Fitz-Harris, and to shew that they ought in such Matters to be sole Judges. Without which, he says, *The Number of Impeachments wou'd be so increased, that the Peers wou'd have no time for any other Business of the Publick*. Again, *The Commons may make Spaniels of the Lords, throw them a Man, and bid them go Judge, as we command a Dog to Fetch and Carry*.³

The sentences quoted as by Dryden may be readily identified upon p. 18 of His *Majesties Declaration Defended*.

¹ Publ. April 8, 1681.

² A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend concerning His Majesties late Declaration touching the Reasons which moved him to dissolve the Two last Parliaments at Westminster and Oxford. n.d. (Yale Library.)

³ L. Echard, *The History of England*, London, 1718, iii, 626-27.

Still we may enquire with what authority Echard spoke when he assigned the pamphlet to Dryden. Something of an answer is discoverable in the historian's bibliography. Born c. 1670, Echard had received his B.A. by 1691, and immediately thereafter launched into a literary career that should have brought him into contact with Dryden. His preface to a translation of Plautus, 1694, is noteworthy for an extended panegyric to the poet, amply repeated the same year in the *Terence*, which has commonly been attributed to him. Dryden was then so much the arbiter of all matters concerning translation and so susceptible to praise that it seems most likely that they corresponded. But probabilities unhappily do not always carry conviction, and so we are forced to fall back upon gossip. An allusion of 1718 is called to the attention of Dryden's bibliographers for whatever it is worth. Its coincidence at this point is striking.

For a number of years during the second decade of the eighteenth century, the Rev. John Thomlinson of Rothbury, Cumberland, kept a diary rich in antiquarian and literary interest. His principal source of information seems to have been an uncle, born 1651 and graduated from Emmanuel College, Cambridge. The latter gives, perhaps, whatever authenticity may be allowed the following entry.

1718. Aug. 3rd. Eachard's history commended by Dr. Ellison. Uncle says he never heard it commended before—he flags in his *Roman History*, the two first volumes only good—Dryden corrected his first volume which made it excellent.¹

According to a statement in his Preface to Vol. III, Echard wrote only the first two volumes of his *Roman History*; and elsewhere (adv. to 2d Edit.) he remarked that aid was lent him in respect to style “by persons of the greatest judgment in these matters, whose names I ought not to mention without their particular leave.” This much we do know certainly, that Dryden was ever unsparing of his advice and active assistance to the minor writers of his time, and that a certain plausibility would be added to the chance remark by his definite interest in historical composition. For our purposes, of course, there remains this conclusion: if Echard was so assisted by Dryden, the truth of his attribution to the latter of the *Declaration Defended* becomes much less open to challenge. He would have been sufficiently close to the final source of information to make it first hand and authentic.

¹ *Six North Country Diaries*, ed. J. C. Hodgson (Surtees Soc.), London, 1910, p. 130.

It is, however, upon internal evidence that we must finally rest our case for Dryden's authorship; and here the task of tracing parallels of thought and phrase holds a singular interest. The *Declaration Defended* anticipated *Absalom and Achitophel* by only a few months, not to mention *The Medal* and *The Duke of Guise*, with a considerable body of brilliantly argued tory doctrine. Could it be proved Dryden's it might illuminate various fine points of the latter creations in addition to rendering valuable testimony upon his activity as historiographer. It is too long and too elaborate in argument for any but the briefest survey in this place. But by the quotation of a sufficient number of passages, apposite to Dryden's in thought or style, we may produce something of an outline that should serve the twofold purpose of clinching the argument for his authorship, and of revealing some added subtleties of his political theory.

After certain preliminary remarks the author sets himself the task of answering, head by head, the various arguments of "The Person of Quality," reproducing them verbatim and italicizing them in the text in the same manner as that subsequently employed by Dryden in his *Vindication of The Duke of Guise*. The second printed page immediately produces a notable parallel of which the context is immaterial, beyond the fact that the quotation is very much more to the point in the doubtful than in the canonized work. In this and in nearly all other cases, *The Declaration Defended* has priority in time—a fact to be remembered, since Dryden frequently imitated himself but rarely his contemporaries. The writer is discussing the subject of addresses:

My Lord Mayor [he remarks] might have only been troubled to have carried the Addresses of *Southwark*, &c. of another nature: without his offering them with one hand, and the City Petition with the other; like the Childrens play of, this Mill grinds Pepper and Spice; that Mill grinds Ratts and Mice. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 4.)

In the *Vindication of the Duke of Guise* we have:

Hitherto there is nothing but boys' play in our authors: *My mill grinds pepper and spice, your mill grinds rats and mice.* (*Vind.*, II, 127.)¹

The next paragraph defends the King against the charge of a subtle design to break the power of Commons:

if it succeeded, not capable of making him so truly Great as he is by

¹ All quotations from Dryden's prose are from *Malone, The Prose Works of John Dryden*, London, 1800. The verse is quoted from *The Poetical Works of John Dryden*, ed. Noyes, Cambridge, 1908.

Law already. If we add to this, his Majesties natural love to Peace and Quiet, which increases in every man with his years, this ridiculous supposition will vanish of itself. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 5.)

The analogous quotation—earlier in this case—is of interest not so much from phrase as from its parallel thought :

A King who is just and moderate in his nature, who rules according to the laws, whom God made happy by forming the temper of his soul to the constitution of his government. . . . (*All for Love*, Ded., II, 5.)

The charge that the King had exceeded his powers in having his *Declaration* "read publicly in Churches" brings this response :

And if the Clergy obey him in so just a Design, is this to be nam'd a blind Obedience ! . . . 'Tis enough that this Declaration is evidently the Kings, and the only true exception which our Answerer has to it, is that he would deny his Majesty the power of clearing his intentions to the people. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 5.)

It is noteworthy that Dryden alluded at least twice subsequently to this reading of the King's *Declaration*, "publicly in churches." His interest in it may thus have had an earlier expression :

Men cite his Majesty's last Declaration against those who dare trifle with parliaments ; a Declaration by the way, which you endeavoured not to have read publicly in churches. . . . (*Vind.* II, 113. Cf. *Hist. of the League*, Ded., II, 433.)

The sixth page contains an interesting allusion to Sancho Panza as governor of the Isle of Barataria being, like Charles, deprived of his food because, forsooth, he was a public person ; and so throughout the tract its author reveals himself as a man of letters. The same page has a curious usage, "*quatenus* a King," that may be compared to the "*Quatenus* subjects" of the *Vindication*, II, 120. Immediately thereafter follows some treatment of the Commons' desire to curtail the King's prerogatives :

Oh, but there is a wicked thing call'd the Militia in their way, and they shew'd they had a moneths mind to it, at the first breaking out of the Popish Plot. If they could once persuade his Majesty, to part graciously with that trifle . . . their argument would be an hundred times more clear. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 6.)

When the representatives of the Commons were either mortally afraid, or pretended to be so, of this airy invasion, a request was actually

made to the King, that he would put the militia into their hands. (*The History of the League*, Postscript, II, 465.)

Kings, who disband such needless aids as these,
Are safe—as long as e'er their subjects please :
(Prologue to *The Loyal Brother*, p. 123.)

The argument continues in the same vein :

he shall be Kept so bare of Money, that Twelve *Holland* ships shall block up the River, or he shall be forc'd to cast himself upon a House of Commons, and to take Money upon their Terms, which will sure be as easie, as those of an *Usurer to an Heir in want*. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 6.)

Alph. Is there any seeming kindness between the King and the Duke of Guise ?

Crit. Yes, most wonderful : they are as dear to one another as an old usurer and a rich young heir upon a mortgage.
(*Duke of Guise*, v, i, ll. 32 ff.)

The thrifty Sanhedrin shall keep him poor ;
And every shekel which he can receive,
Shall cost a limb of his prerogative.
(*Abs. and Achit.*, p. 114, n. 390 ff.)

The *Declaration Defended*, p. 6, remarks upon a design to push the King into a French war, the same end in view. With this compare the Prologue to *The Duke of Guise* :

Push him to wars, but still no pence advance,
Let him lose England, to recover France.

I am able to find no parallels for the matter upon pp. 7-8, which is largely given over to an airy consideration of the Duchesses of Mazarine and Portsmouth and of their influence. It is handled in a style akin to Dryden's best manner. Page 9 has a reference to "the most ingenious of your Authors, I mean *Plato Redivivus*," who reappears on p. 13. That Dryden had attentively read this whiggish pamphleteer of 1680 is evident from the Postscript to *The History of the League* (II, 463. Cf. Malone's note.) The same page of the *Declaration Defended* contains a long section demonstrating the parallel to English conditions of the Guisard League in France, a theme to which Dryden subsequently devoted his tragedy *The Duke of Guise*, a *Vindication*, and a *History*.

The next quoted passage contains a remarkable argument that the author apparently derived from Hobbes. Dryden's debt to the philosopher of Malmesbury has been recognized and was acknow-

ledged. Thus Noyes in a note upon a kindred passage in *Absalom and Achitophel* makes the following remarks :

Unlike most Tories, [Dryden] grounds the royal power not on *divine right*, but on a *covenant* made by the governed, to avoid the anarchy of a state of nature *where all have right to all*. He thus shows his sceptical turn of mind by accepting a fundamental tenet of Hobbes. He will not, however, agree with Hobbes that this covenant once made is irrevocable, since such a conclusion leaves the people defenceless. Yet he sees, as well as Hobbes himself, that to admit that the governed can revoke their covenant, opens the door to anarchy.¹

The Defender's argument is much to the same effect :

But what can we think of his next Axiome, that it was never known that Laws signified anything to a People, who had not the sole guard of their own Prince, Government and Laws ?

Here all our Fore-fathers are Arraign'd at once for trusting the Executive power of the Laws in their Princes hands. And yet you see the Government has made a shift to shuffle on for so many hundred years together, under this miserable oppression ; and no man so wise in so many ages to find out, that *Magna Charta* was to no purpose, while there was a King. I confess in Countreys, where the Monarch governs absolutely, and the Law is either his Will, or depending on it, this noble Maxim might take place ; But since we are neither *Turks*, *Russians*, nor *Frenchmen*, to affirm that in our Countrey, in a Monarchy of so temperate and wholesome a Constitution, Laws are of no validity, because they are not in the disposition of the People, plainly infers that no Government but that of a Commonwealth can preserve our Liberties and Privileges : for though the Title of a Prince be allow'd to continue, yet if the People must have the sole guard and Government of him and of the Laws, 'tis but facing an whole hand of Trumps, with an insignificant King of another sute. And which is worst of all, if this be true, there can be no Rebellion, for then the people is the supream power. And if the Representatives of the Common shall jarr with the other two estates, and with the King it would be no Rebellion to adhere to them in that War : to which I know that every Republican who reads this, must of necessity Answer, *No more it would not*. Then farewell the Good Act of Parliament, which makes it Treason to Levy Arms, against the present King, upon any pretences whatsoever. For if this be a Right of Nature, and consequently never to be Resign'd, there never has been, nor ever can be any pact betwixt King and People, and Mr. *Hobbs* would tell us, *That we are still in a state of War*. (*Decl. Def.*, pp. 9-10.)

The argument has many parallels in Dryden, both of phrase and thought, of which the following perhaps may serve :

¹ *The Poetical Works of John Dryden*, p. 954.

*What shall we think ! Can people give away,
Both for themselves and sons, their native sway ?
Then they are left defenseless to the sword
Of each unbounded, arbitrary lord :
And laws are vain, by which we right enjoy,
If kings unquestion'd can those laws destroy.
Yet if the crowd be judge of fit and just,
And kings are only officers in trust,
Then this resuming cov'nant was declar'd
When Kings were made, or is forever barr'd.*

(*Abs. and Achit.*, p. 119, ll. 759 ff.)

*Our temp'rate isle will no extremes sustain
Of pop'lar sway or arbitrary reign,
But slides between them both into the best ;
Secure in freedom, in a monarch blest.*

(*The Medal*, p. 131, ll. 248 ff.)

*He should have leave to exercise the name,
And hold the cards, while commons play'd the game.*

(*The Medal*, p. 131, ll. 233-34.)

*If Kings may be excluded, or depos'd,
When e'er you cry Religion to the Crowd,
That Doctrine makes Rebellion Orthodox,
And subjects must be Traytors to be sav'd.*

(*The Duke of Guise*, Act. 1, scene i.)

*Not only crowds, but Sanhedrins may be
Infected with this public lunacy, . . .
If they may give and take when e'er they please,
Not kings alone, (the Godhead's images,)
But government itself at length must fall
To nature's state, where all have right to all.*

(*Abs. and Achit.*, p. 119, ll. 787 ff.)

The eleventh page has some material upon the duplicity of the Irish witnesses, which reminds one of the couplet in *Absalom and Achitophel* :

*Against themselves their witnesses will swear,
Till viper-like their mother Plot they tear.*

(*Abs. and Achit.*, p. 122, ll. 1012-13.)

The twelfth deals with the succession and Divine Right :

We read of a divine Command to obey Superior Powers ; and the Duke will lawfully be such, no Bill of Exclusion having passed against him in his Brother's life. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 12.)

Yes, I can tell them one other way to express their loyalty, which is, to obey the King, and to respect his brother as the next lawful successor: their religion commands them both, and the government is secured in so doing. (*Vindication*, II, 112.)

In an identical juxtaposition in both places follows the praise of the Duke's rival, Monmouth:

I am not ashamed to say, that I particularly honour the Duke of Monmouth. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 12.)

And I am of their number who truly honour him [Monmouth]. (*Vindication*, II, 112. Cf. also Preface to *Abs. and Achit.*, II, 296-97.)

But Monmouth would shortly discover the rapacity of his adherents: Conquerors are not easily to be curbed. And it is yet harder to conceive, that his [Monmouth's] pretended Friends, even design him so much as that. At present, 'tis true, their mutual necessities keep them fast together, . . . but suppose the business compassed, as they design'd it, how many, and how contradicting interests are to be satisfied! Every Sect of High Shooes would then be uppermost; and not one of them endure the toleration of another. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 12.)

And frogs and toads, and all the tadpole train,
Will croak to Heav'n for help from this devouring crane.
The cutthroat sword and clamorous gown shall jar,
In sharing their ill-gotten spoils of war. . . .

(*The Medal*, p. 132, ll. 304 ff.)

And the Protestant successor himself, if he be not wholly governed by the prevailing party, will first be declared no Protestant; and next no successor . . . none but a pack of Sectaries and Commonwealth-men [will be] left in England. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 13.)

our associators and sectaries are men of commonwealth principles, and though their first stroke was only aimed at the immediate succession, it was most manifest that it would not there have ended, for at the same time they were hewing at your royal prerogatives; so that the next successor, if there had been any, must have been a precarious prince, and depended on them for the necessities of life. (*History of the League*, Ded. II, 432.)

Now comes an attack upon the Person of Quality into which more of the rhetorician entered than of the Historiographer:

I will forgive him two false Grammars and three Barbarisms, in every Period of his Pamphlet. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 13.)

Correctness was ever a shibboleth to the laureate—witness his earlier attack upon Elkanah Settle:

what is here is only selected fustian, impertinence, and false grammar

... for I am sure there are no four lines together, which are free from some error, and commonly a gross one. (*Notes and Observations on The Empress of Morocco*, II, 279.)

Page 15 of *The Declaration Defended* has much to do with the various petitions of Commons for the removal of Charles's friends : without Process, order of Law, hearing any Defence, or offering any proof against them. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 15.)

The argument appears elsewhere, and frequently. He asks : whether frequent votes did not pass in the House of Commons at several times for removing and turning out of office those who on all occasions behaved themselves most loyally to the King, without so much as giving any other reason of their misdemeanours than publick fame,—that is to say, reports forged and spread by their own faction ; or without allowing them the common justice of vindicating themselves from those calumnies and aspersions. (*History of the League*, Postscript, II, 420.)

No groundless clamors shall my friends remove,
Nor crowds have pow'r to punish ere they prove,
For gods and godlike kings their care express,
Still to defend their servants in distress.
(*Abs. and Achit.*, p. 122, ll. 995 ff.)

As to the King being a public servant with the right in his private capacity only to eat and drink, there is sketched on the next page a sorry picture of Charles's misadventures under the Scottish kirk, a matter less capably handled but to the same effect in his Postscript to *The History of the League* (II, 442).

Page 18 is concerned with the Fitz-Harris matter, which nowhere in Dryden's accepted works is given such consideration. Nor has p. 19 or p. 20 much more to the immediate point, though the final page provides an allusion to Æsop's ass, for which he showed some fondness in the *Vindication* (II, 113), also the statement that his opponent admits himself an angry man, which was a line of attack later employed upon Hunt, and, finally, some triumphing over his whiggish enemies as their dissolution commenced to set in :

his party is mouldring away, and as it falls out, in all dishonest Combinations, are suspecting each other so very fast, that everyman is shifting for himself, by a separate Treaty : and looking out for a Plank in the common Shipwreck. (*Decl. Def.*, p. 20.)

Identical to this in substance is the following : the scene is changed, and they are more in danger of being betrayed every man by his companion, than they were formerly by the joint forces of their enemies. (*Hist. of the League*, Postscript, II, 456.)

Thus, 1681-1684 witnessed the growing estate of the Historiographer Royal—years in which he wielded an influence comparable to that of the great pamphleteers of the next century. And that *His Majesties Declaration Defended* was possibly the first important exercise of his powers in the political field does not seem an unsafe deduction from the evidence at hand. It has with some show of authority been attributed to his pen; it is completely in accord with his tory doctrine, containing as it does hardly an idea that he does not advert to somewhere in his accepted writings; and it has, finally, notable similarities both to his phrasing and rhetorical usage. Parallels between diverse authors might easily occur, but not so extensively nor so systematically as here; nor, as remarked, would Dryden scarcely have echoed in his admitted works the phrase and thoughts of an anonymous pamphleteer—other than himself. He was both proud and vulnerable. If, then, I have seemed to quote from it at too great length, it has been from the desire not merely to fix its authorship, but to provide some taste of its style, otherwise denied because of excessive rarity. The *Declaration Defended* seems to have been Dryden's. Its importance to his other poems and pamphlets in the same vein is that the ideas in this tract were developed with an illuminating clarity not always touched elsewhere. It displays him in the full possession of his official manner. 'Tis pity that no other such historiographer was present to carry forward the tradition.

ASPECTS OF LIFE AND THOUGHT IN *ROBINSON CRUSOE*

BY HANS W. HAUSERMANN

I.—INTRODUCTION

IN the year 1719 Daniel Defoe produced his great novel *Robinson Crusoe*. Defoe had lived fifty-eight years amongst influences and interests which are clearly mirrored in his book. Life and thought, as seen in *Robinson Crusoe*, fall into three main sections, the religious, the commercial, the politico-social; and on reading the life of Defoe we find that he was educated for the pulpit, that he became enamoured of money-making, and that he played a certain part in the politics of his time. These aspects of Defoe's novel have already been fully treated by students of his work. It cannot, therefore, be the purpose of this paper to discover any new points of view. The work of P. Dottin, G. Hübener, and others could not be improved upon by the present writer. Indeed, the first part of this paper merely aims at a systematic survey of their discoveries. By investigating one or another of the aspects of *Robinson Crusoe* modern critics have often emphasized their particular point of view to the detriment of a just and objective evaluation of the novel. Based on an impartial and systematic survey, the present study undertakes to assign to each aspect of life and thought in Defoe's novel its due place and importance.

1. *Defoe the Dissenter.*

James Foe, the father of Daniel Defoe, was a baptist. The family of the Foes assiduously attended the meetings of a presbyterian church conducted by the Rev. Annesley. When this excellent man died in 1697 Defoe produced in his memory an enthusiastic poem, *The Character of the late D. Samuel Annesley by Way of Elegy*. The religious atmosphere in which Defoe was brought up reached its greatest ardour during the Plague of 1665 and the Great Fire of the following year. These events could not have passed

without influencing Defoe, who was then a child of six years. As soon as he was able to write, his mother made him copy long passages from the Bible. Thus he copied the whole Pentateuch. These early readings of the Bible left an inextinguishable mark on Defoe's style and also on his way of thinking.

His father had destined him for the ministry, and Defoe entered an academy at Newington Green when he was fourteen years old. The headmaster of this school for dissenters was Charles Morton, an excellent professor and a distinguished scholar who afterwards became vice-president of Harvard College in America, whither he was forced to emigrate. Morton was a pioneer of modern education. He tried to react against the exclusively classical education which students received at Oxford and Cambridge, and, consequently, Defoe's knowledge in Latin and Greek was scanty. At Newington Academy both time and labour were devoted to subjects like shorthand, modern languages (French, Dutch, Spanish, and Italian), history, natural science, geography, and astronomy. In addition to these arts students received a thorough training for their future work as clergymen. Charles Morton imbued the boys with a love of discussion, especially on matters relating to theology, and it is to these early exercises that Defoe owes much of his facility for improvisation in the vernacular. The oratorical and sermonlike style of much of his writing is easily traceable to the same source.

Defoe looked back always with great regard to Charles Morton, and especially approved of such of his methods as enabled students to become "masters of the English tongue"¹. The religious education he received in the academy was intended to fit him for the nonconformist pulpit, and this, together with the early training of his presbyterian parents, created in him the ardent dissenter and serious moral teacher.

2. Defoe the Merchant.

In his *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, Cazamian says of Defoe that "nul écrivain n'est plus exactment, dans le domaine littéraire, le porte-parole de la bourgeoisie commerçante de son temps."² Defoe's father was a Chandler, though he afterwards took up the more lucrative profession of a butcher. He prospered and retired

¹ H. Morley, *The Earlier Life and the Chief Earlier Works of Daniel Defoe*, London, 1889, p. 16.

² Paris: Hachette, 1924, p. 750.

upon a competency. His son Daniel inherited some of the commercial abilities of his father. He refused to become a dissenting minister though he had been destined for the ministry by his parents. He wanted to become rich and to raise himself out of the middle-class into which he had been born. He considered the position of nonconformist minister both precarious and degrading; therefore, in spite of the training at Newington, he turned to trade.

Next he was sent as an apprentice to a wine-merchant. In this capacity he travelled over England and the Continent, and probably went to Portugal, Spain, France, and Italy. On these journeys he acquired a wide knowledge of foreign people and their customs. In 1683 he established himself as a hosier in Freeman's Court, then one of the busiest and most active parts of the City of London. In the *Review* (11, 149, 150) he denied that he had been a "hosier," and claimed to have been a "hose factor" or middleman between the manufacturer and the retailer. He married a wife who brought him a dowry of nearly four thousand pounds, a sum which he soon lost in speculations. He made ventures in ships' cargoes, and in 1692 suffered losses that reduced him to bankruptcy. In order to escape imprisonment and to avoid an obdurate creditor, Defoe fled to Bristol, where he was known as the "Sunday gentleman," for being abroad only on the day when he was free from arrest. His debt having been at last reduced, by composition with his creditors, to five thousand pounds, Defoe, in 1694, was free again to earn. He did not return to his old office in Freeman's Court, but he attached himself to works at Tilbury for the manufacture of Dutch tiles. The accession of William III had brought the use of Dutch tiles into fashion, and it was a profitable speculation to provide a supply of them within easy reach of the London builders, who might otherwise have gone to Holland for them. Defoe became sole owner of the Pantile Works, and his success enabled him to proceed towards the full payment of his creditors. His new prosperity was such as to enable him to possess a coach and a pleasure boat.

This period of Defoe's life ended with the year 1703, when he was sentenced to pay a fine of two hundred marks and to stand three times in the pillory for publishing an ironical treatise on Dissenters. He had to abandon his business at Tilbury and was kept in prison till November 1703, when he was released thanks to financial support granted him by Robert Harley, later Lord Oxford,

who had just been appointed Secretary of State and who had need of Defoe's pen.

Defoe thought highly of the importance of trade, and he was himself a thorough tradesman. If he lacked perseverance and prudence, he certainly possessed, on the other hand, the clear sight and width of vision of a man of business.

3. *Defoe the Politician.*

Defoe's literary career commenced in the year 1704. Harley, who had bought him out of prison, was the first English minister to appreciate the influence of the press. In religious matters Defoe was staunch and true to his nonconformist principles. He had taken an active part in the campaign with Monmouth in 1685. And when some of his fellow students at Newington were condemned to death for participating in the rebellion, he conceived a hatred of popery which he never lost during the rest of his life.

But in matters political he was politic—that is, he changed his masters and his opinions to suit his convenience. By accepting an offer to act as a secret agent of the government, Defoe was able to support his wife and six children. He wrote pamphlets and satires which greatly affected public opinion. He grew acquainted with the great leaders of the time, and through the medium of his witty pen he commanded not a small following. He became an expert in the art of conducting and eluding intrigues, and often availed himself of little stratagems to escape the persecutions of his political enemies.

We are not concerned here with the apparent and flagrant inconsistencies of his conduct as a politician and journalist. We merely state the fact that Defoe during his activity as an agent of the government showed uncommon ability and great talents as a politician.

II.—THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN *ROBINSON CRUSOE*

1. *Puritan Theology.*

It may be remarked that Defoe during his journalistic and political career frequently transgressed the warp of rectitude and wise precept in which he had early been instructed. Into his

political pamphlets he introduced quotations from Lord Rochester, whose licentious poems were favourably received by the general public at the time of the Restoration. Towards old age he became more Puritan and gradually effected a complete return to the austere morality of his youth, and after 1715 we find no more quotations from Rochester in his writings.¹ *The Family Instructor*, which appeared in 1718, is the first sign of a complete restoration. As this pious manual met with great success, Defoe continued in the same vein and published another treatise of a similar character in 1722, entitled *Religious Courtship*. Defoe's first novel, *Robinson Crusoe*, appeared in 1719, and belongs to the category of the above-mentioned works, having also a pious end in view.

Puritanism is based on Calvin's doctrine of predestination. It was this dogma which gave the Puritans of the sixteenth and seventeenth century their deep and severe piety. They were convinced that, in the matter of salvation, their own efforts availed them nought, and that their spiritual welfare depended entirely upon God's grace. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the old Calvinistic doctrine was already much altered: it had undergone the humanizing influence of rationalism.

Bunyan's pilgrim Christian is converted when meditating upon the Scriptures. Defoe employs a more vigorous means to accomplish the conversion of his hero: Robinson's piety is caused by attacks of fever and a great fear of death. This entire dread of the great Unknown, this profound terror of the Land of Beyond, amounted almost to a cruel superstition among the followers of Calvin. "But now," says Robinson Crusoe, "when I began to be sick, and a leisurely view of the miseries of death came to place itself before me, when my spirits began to sink under the burden of a strong distemper and nature was exhausted with the violence of fever; conscience, that had slept so long, began to awake, and I began to reproach myself with my past life. . . . If I should be sick, I shall certainly die for want of help, and what will become of me! Then the tears burst out of my eyes, and I could say no more for a good while" (p. 45).² He was proud of calling his habitation a "castle" (p. 65), and it was only between its walls that he lost some of his continual fear of wild beasts and savages. The footmark on the shore terrified him so much that he dared not

¹ P. Dottin, *Daniel De Foe et ses romans*. Thèse, Paris, 1924, p. 46.

² All quotations from *Robinson Crusoe* refer to Hazlitt's edition (1841), vol. ii.

leave his castle for three days and nights (p. 67), and he lived under "uneasinesses" for years afterwards (p. 68).

The God of the Calvinist was the stern, revengeful God of the Old Testament. His justice was incorruptible. Robinson found it hard to explain to his man Friday why God would not kill the devil and "so make him no more wicked" (p. 86). While instructing the poor savage he realized that the theological foundations of his creed were anything but thoroughly thought out, and he confessed this with a winning openness: "I had, God knows, more sincerity than knowledge in all the methods I took for this poor creature's instruction; and must acknowledge . . . that in laying things open to him I really informed and instructed myself in many things that either I did not know or had not fully considered before" (p. 86).

The theology of the Puritans was wholly founded on the Scriptures. Robinson repeatedly thanked Providence for having given him a Bible as a companion on his island. He was constantly studying this "sure guide to heaven, viz., the word of God" (p. 87), and he quotes it many times. He read the Bible daily and applied the comforts it contains to his actual state. He had no words to thank Providence for having granted him this comfort: "I never opened the Bible or shut it, but my very soul within me blessed God for directing my friend in England, without any order of mine, to pack it among my goods, and for assisting me afterwards to save it out of the wreck of the ship" (p. 52). He had no use for the services of a clergyman to explain the Bible to him: "Another thing I cannot refrain from observing here also from experience in this retired part of my life, viz., how infinite and inexpressible a blessing it is that the knowledge of God, and of the doctrine of salvation by Jesus Christ, is so plainly laid down in the word of God, so easy to be received and understood, that as the bare reading the scripture made me capable of understanding enough of my duty to carry me directly on to the great work of sincere repentance for my sins . . . and this without any teacher or instructor, I mean human" (p. 87).

Robinson was fond of using the Bible as an oracle. In the agony of his illness, he "took up the Bible and began to read; . . . only having opened the book casually, the first words that occurred to me were these, 'Call on me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver, and thou shalt glorify me'" (p. 46). Being so long alone

in his island, his only interlocutor was the Bible, and he carefully looked it through for passages which might be interpreted as applying to his particular circumstances. So, for instance, he wrote in his diary on July 4: "In the morning I took the Bible; and . . . I began seriously to read it, and imposed upon myself to read awhile every morning and every night. . . . I was earnestly begging of God to give me repentance, when it happened providentially the very day, that, reading the scripture, I came to these words: 'He is exalted a Prince, and a Saviour, to give repentance, and to give remission,' I threw down the book, and with my heart as well as my hand lifted up to heaven . . . I cried out aloud, 'Jesus, thou son of David . . . give me repentance'" (p. 47).

Like a true Puritan, Robinson Crusoe attached a great importance to the part played by Divine Providence in man's life. He knew that all his deeds, good and wicked, were carefully recorded above, and that, some day or other, he must account for them. At the same time God was merciful and helped the repentant sinner. Events which seemed at first to be the greatest calamities afterwards proved to be especially calculated blessings and benefits. "So little," Robinson says, "do we see before us in the world, and so much reason have we to depend cheerfully upon the great maker of the world, that he does not leave his creatures so absolutely destitute, but that in the worst circumstances they have always something to be thankful for, and sometimes are nearer their deliverance by the means by which they seem to be brought to their destruction" (p. 97). Misfortunes seemed to lose their power of making him miserable, because they appeared as relative blessings. It was the greatest consolation to Robinson to think that his miserable condition might still have been more miserable. When complaining once at his terrible condition, his reason answered him thus: "Well, you are in a desolate condition, 'tis true; but pray remember, where are the rest of you? Did not you come eleven of you into the boat? Where are the ten? Why were they not saved and you lost? Why were you singled out? Is it better to be here or there? and then I pointed to the sea. All evils are to be considered with the good that is in them, and with what worse attended them" (p. 36). Thoughts of this kind constantly occupied Robinson's mind. The whole course of his life assumed the deep significance of being exclusively meant as an illustration of the influence, seen and unseen, of Providence. In reference

to his deliverance from the island by means of the Spanish ship, Robinson explained a similar idea to the captain whom he had rescued from the hands of his mutinous crew: "I told him, I looked upon him as a man sent from Heaven to deliver me, and that the whole transaction seemed to me a chain of wonders; that such things as these were the testimonies we had of a secret hand of Providence governing the world, and an evidence that the eyes of an infinite power could search into the remotest corner of the world, and send help to the miserable whenever he pleased" (p. 104).

There are two effects which follow necessarily from such a conception of the "rôle" of Providence: the individual who is thus wholly reliant on a benevolent influence and kindly protection from above is only too willing to consider himself the centre of the world, as if everything were meant for his personal welfare and benefit. The second result is a certain fatalism, a carelessness and an energetic optimism which leaves no room for the demoralizing influence and weakening reaction of despair. Robinson thinks himself particularly high in God's favour when he says: "... after I saw barley grow there, in a climate which I knew was not proper for corn, and especially that I know not how it came there, it startled me strangely, and I began to suggest, that God had miraculously caused this grain to grow without any help of seed sown, and that it was so directed purely for my sustenance on that wild miserable place" (p. 41). Robinson did not hesitate to believe that God sent an angel to him in his dream in order to wake up his sleeping conscience (p. 44). The arrival of Friday, too, was prophesied to him in a dream (pp. 79, 80). On the other hand, his fatalism, which resulted from too absolute a reliance on the help of Providence, is shown several times very clearly. He endured the hardships of his destiny with a stoical equanimity, and numerous are the passages where he resorts to active work, throwing behind all useless lamentations. Seeing himself alone on the desolate island, he almost despaired. All his comrades of the ship were drowned. "This forced tears from my eyes again," says he, "but as there was little relief in that, I resolved, if possible, to get to the ship. . . ." (p. 31 f.).

2. *Puritan Ethics.*

The most important thing about Puritan ethics is the recognized fact that it "added a halo of sanctification to the appeal of economic

expediency."¹ Puritan ethics combine the duties of religion with the calls of business, and they teach that money-making, if not free from spiritual dangers, is in itself not a danger, but that it can and ought to be carried on for the greater glory of God. The first duty of the Christian is to believe in God. But mere faith is not enough: the genuine faith is that which produces works. The second duty of the Christian is therefore to labour in the affairs of practical life, and this second duty is subordinate only to the first. Thus, the conscientious discharge of the duties of business is counted among the loftiest of religious and moral virtues. The significance of this labour lies in the ascetic discipline which is to be undergone for the sake of God's greater glory. Its value does not consist in the production of what Protestants called "good works"; the Puritan did not want to perform any meritorious acts: his aim was a holy life—a systematic and organized life, the work of an iron will and a cool intelligence. When speaking of the Puritan English tradesman of the early eighteenth century, Tawney says: "To such a generation, a creed which transformed the acquisition of wealth from a drudgery or a temptation into a moral duty was the milk of lions. It was not that religion was expelled from practical life, but that religion itself gave it a foundation of granite. In that keen atmosphere of economic enterprise, the ethics of the Puritan bore some resemblance to those associated later with the name of Smiles. The good Christian was not wholly dissimilar from the economic man."²

This identification of labour and enterprise with the service of God excluded the idea that the world existed for purposes of enjoyment. The world had to be conquered by the man who would deserve the name of Christian. In winning the world, he wins the salvation of his own soul as well. This is exactly what Robinson Crusoe did on his desolate island. Through his intense and earnest labour, carried on with system and method, concentration and foresight, Defoe's hero not only made his desert island a prospering little kingdom (p. 93), but, at the same time, he made his peace with God and saved his soul.

Excluded by the law from participation in public affairs, Dissenters of means and social position like Defoe threw themselves

¹ R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism: A Historical Study* London, 1926, p. 240.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 253.

into the alternative career offered by commerce and finance, and did so the more readily because religion itself had blessed their choice. Defoe, having failed at trade, turned to literature, but he brought with him all the ethical principles of a Puritan tradesman. He thought it one of the indispensable qualities of a merchant to be honest in his dealings: he was scrupulously so himself and wanted other people to be the same. Robinson Crusoe did not even make an exception in the case of the Spanish captain who had saved his life (p. 106). Defoe never hinted at so much as the shadow of a possible conflict between religion and business. Robinson saw no reasonable objection to the slave trade (p. 28), and the book ends not in modest contentment and in pious contemplation, but with an enumeration of the immense riches acquired by its hero. Robinson ascribed his great misfortunes to the want of one particular virtue: he lacked prudence. Thus, when he entered the fatal ship which carried him to the desolate island he made the confession: "But I was hurried on, and obeyed blindly the dictates of my fancy rather than my reason" (p. 29). His imprudence was the sin of which he considered himself most guilty: "I rejected the voice of Providence, which had mercifully put me in a posture or station of life wherein I might have been happy and easy; but I would neither see it myself nor learn to know the blessings of it from my parents; I left them to mourn over my folly, and now I am left to mourn under the consequences of it" (p. 45).

Except this cardinal virtue of the Puritan, prudence, Robinson Crusoe possessed all the others, such as diligence, moderation, sobriety, and thrift. There is no need to support this statement by examples. The manifest approval of Providence which followed all his work on the island is in itself a confirmation of Robinson's virtuousness. We find nothing else but the attitude which was typical of the Puritan trader and which consisted in the identification of enterprise with the discharge of a duty imposed by God. The economic tendency coincided with the religious commandment. The shrewd, calculating commercialism displayed by Robinson Crusoe during all his life before and after his forced seclusion on the island, his acquisitiveness, and his drudgery, all this was sanctified by the precepts of the Puritan creed.¹

¹ Cf. Max Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, Tübingen, 1920. Especially "Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus," pp. 17-206.

The ethics of the Puritan are heterogeneous, that is, the ethical behaviour of the Puritan is not based on innate principles of morality, but on religious laws as laid down in the Bible. The heterogeneity of Puritan ethics is the consequence of a pessimistic sequence of thought in man's mind. There is no natural goodness in man. We find in Defoe the same conception, this very want of confidence in his fellow men. Robinson even distrusted Friday, his faithful servant, who betrayed signs of joy at seeing in the distance the shores of his native island. "I observed," says Robinson Crusoe, "an extraordinary sense of pleasure appeared in his face, and his eyes sparkled, and his countenance discovered a strange eagerness, as if he had a mind to be in his own country again; and this observation of mine put a great many thoughts into me, which made me at first not so easy about my new man Friday as I was before; and I made no doubt but that, if Friday could get back to his own nation, he would not only forget all his religion but all his obligation to me, and would be forward enough to give his countrymen an account of me, and come back perhaps with a hundred or two of them and make a feast upon me, at which he might be as merry as he used to be with those of his enemies when they were taken in war" (p. 88). Thereafter he would not suffer Friday to sleep in the same room with him, but bade him lie down on the other side of the wall of his castle, always taking care that Friday could not get at the fire-arms (p. 83). Before Robinson would enter into any details of the liberation of the sixteen Spaniards and Portuguese from the island of the cannibals, he constrained them to promise "upon their solemn oath, that they would be absolutely under my [*scilicet* Robinson's] leading as their commander and captain; and that they should swear upon the holy sacraments and gospel to be true to me. . . ." (p. 95). Robinson thought his distrust quite legitimate, considering "that gratitude was no inherent virtue in the nature of man; nor did men always square their feelings by the obligations they had received, so much as they did by the advantages they expected" (p. 94).

3. *Puritan Aesthetics.*

As everything which the Puritan does should contribute to the greater glory of God, the value of art and literature as æsthetic products of the human mind cannot be a great one. The Calvinistic

doctrine is the cause of the sterility in artistic and literary production in all countries which adopted it. The Puritan ascetic considered poetry, the theatre, music, dancing, and art in general to be so many snares of the devil. Such an exclusively utilitarian conception of life resulted in a comprehensive and instinctive distrust of all things emotional: thus we find Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* almost entirely devoid of poetical ornamentation or literary embellishment.

Robinson Crusoe is not divided into chapters, the narration runs on without distinct cuts. Nevertheless, Defoe used a means that compensates, in parts at least, for the lack of a clearly visible construction: he prepares the reader for later events by announcements like this: "Thus I took all the measures human prudence could suggest for my own preservation; and it will be seen at length, that they were not altogether without just reason, though I foresaw nothing at that time more than my mere fear suggested" (p. 68). Another of these announcements which tended at the same time to keep the reader's attention alive, is this: "The second thing I would fain have had was a tobacco pipe, but it was impossible for me to make one; however I found a contrivance for that too at last" (p. 50). A similar artistic value can be attributed to the oft recurring exclamations of bitter remembrance: "But, alas! this was but a taste of the misery I was to go through, as will appear in the sequel of this story" (p. 22), or: "... and thus I cast myself down into the deepest gulph of human misery that ever man fell into" (p. 28). Friday's arrival is carefully prepared by several announcements. After having seen the footprint on the shore, Robinson knew that he was not the only living man on the island: also, and from a safe distance, he observed two visits by the cannibals. The next sign was a prophetic dream, in which he saw a savage fleeing towards his castle (p. 80), and only then the real thing happened (p. 81).

Defoe did not care for elaborate transitions. He introduced new events with simple phrases like this: "But to go on..." (p. 68), or: "When this was done, I..." (p. 68), or: "But to return to my story" (p. 76). The discovery of the footprint on the shore, which frightened Robinson for many months (p. 75), is introduced with the simple words: "It happened one day about noon, going towards my boat, I was exceedingly surprised with the print of a man's naked foot on the shore..." (p. 65).

A clumsiness of the narration is perhaps due to the many repetitions: thus, when speaking about his goats, Robinson never omits to remind the reader of their usefulness in that they allowed Robinson to save his gunpowder: he killed them without using his gun. Thus, too, he explains several times the complicated arrangement of the ladders over which he used to climb into his castle.

Defoe's hero was a man of no learning, he was a merchant and a sailor. This explains why Defoe made him use the language of the middle-class and ordinary tradesman. The proportion of words of Anglo-Saxon origin to French words is largely to the disadvantage of the latter.¹

Also from the point of view of syntax, we can observe a strongly marked popular usage. Defoe's frequent use of the adjectival adverb is not a sign of colloquial or even vulgar language. According to Lannert, the use of the flat adverb as intensifying a following adjectival word or an adverb was, in the works of the classical authors at the beginning of the eighteenth century, far commoner than the corresponding inflectional form. Such adjectival adverbs are "exceeding, extreme, excellent, excessive, mighty, monstrous, dreadful, perfect, terrible, violent, vast." On the other hand, the inflectional adverb is practically the only one in use when it qualifies a past participle, e.g., "dreadfully frightened," "exceedingly diverted," "wonderfully delighted."²

In these, as in all other instances of a different usage from present-day English, Defoe closely resembles his contemporaries. Thus, after the careful investigation made by Lannert, it is impossible to attribute to Defoe's language a more archaic character than that of contemporary works of fiction. In certain cases Robinson Crusoe shows even less divergence from present-day English than they.³ Its lack of literary adornment is compensated by liveliness and directness of style: "He never aimed . . . at being a stylist in the modern sense of the word, *i.e.*, a literary artist who for merely æsthetic purposes takes pains to turn out sentences of fine rhythm and choice phrasing. . . . He was always eminently practical and didactic, a man of affairs and of business."⁴ On the other hand, the simplicity of Defoe's style is often spoilt by the abundance of

¹ Cf. G. L. Lannert, *An Investigation into the Language of Robinson Crusoe as Compared with that of Other Eighteenth-Century Works*, Uppsala, 1910, p. 14.

² *Ibid.*, p. 115.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

matter which he tried to put into one sentence. One feels that Defoe had much to say, and that his mind was overflowing with ideas. Robinson Crusoe is not always free from talkativeness. He cannot refrain from accompanying all the events of his life with a continuous commentary. He does not hesitate to remind the reader of things he had already said by clumsy phrases like this: "as I observed above" (pp. 38, 81), or: "I mentioned before that . . ." (p. 50), and he naively observes: "But I must go on with the historical part of things, and take every part in its order" (p. 87).

Defoe's style is sober and simple. He avoids metaphors and similes, though, incidentally, we find a beautiful passage like this: "It is as impossible as needless to set down the innumerable crowd of thoughts that whirled through that great thoroughfare of the brain, the memory, in this night's time" (p. 79).

(To be continued)

VAUGHAN AND WORDSWORTH

BY HELEN N. McMASTER

THE discovery of literary relationships is a fascinating if not always profitable pastime. Sometimes the belief that one poet has been influenced by another gains a credence that is not substantiated by facts. Henry Vaughan, the Silurist, whose few but judicious friends believed that his verse would be a lasting monument, suffered a total eclipse for a hundred and fifty years. Scholars of the nineteenth century who interested themselves in the neglected poets of the mid-seventeenth century rescued Vaughan from obscurity, but these Victorian partisans as it were attached him to the skirts of Wordsworth's muse, hoping in that way to gain a hearing for him among the lovers of *Tintern Abbey* and *Intimations of Immortality*. To-day Vaughan has acquired a public in his own right; *The Retreat* claims attention upon its own merit and is no longer thought of merely as a "quaint" poem which inspired Wordsworth. The spiritual kinship between Vaughan and Wordsworth is remarkable, and it is not surprising that earlier scholars who first unearthed Vaughan were led into an enthusiastic but ill-considered belief that Wordsworth must have been influenced by Vaughan. When Archbishop Trench announced that Wordsworth had owned a copy of *Silex Scintillans*, critical discretion was thrown to the winds. The belief that Wordsworth had actually been influenced by Vaughan became a presumption which has remained unquestioned, receiving sanction in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, whence it reappears in various histories of more recent date. A review of the evidence will, I believe, prove that this presumption, born of and nurtured by the desire that it should be true, is unwarranted.

Among his contemporaries, Vaughan's audience had not been large. Only one of his volumes appeared in a second edition, and that was made up in part of remainders of the first edition. His verses did not find their way into the anthologies of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; neither Thomas Warton nor

Samuel Johnson seems to have known of his existence. To George Ellis in the third edition of his *Specimens of Early English Poets* (1803) belongs the honour of discovering Vaughan. He reprinted the first, second, and fourth stanzas of *To the best, and Most Accomplish'd Couple* together with a few biographical details from Anthony à Wood. The selection was not one to attract notice or to incite interest in Vaughan, although its inclusion may have served to call Thomas Campbell's attention to this unknown poet. Campbell apparently read *Silex Scintillans*, for in his *Specimens of the British Poets* (1819) he included the first two stanzas of *The Timber*, eighteen lines from *The Rain-bow*, and *The Wreath*. Of Vaughan, Campbell wrote: "He is one of the hardest even of the inferior order of the school of conceit; but he has some few scattered thoughts that meet our eye amidst his harsh pages like wild flowers on a barren heath." One of these wild flowers, a line from Vaughan's *The Rain-bow*, Campbell plucked and used in his own poem of the same title, a plagiarism which did not escape the vigilance of "Detector," who sent a few caustic comments upon the fact to *Blackwood's Magazine* in a letter published July, 1825. Yet this can scarcely be called recognition for Vaughan. The poems in Campbell's abbreviated excerpts were not impressive. Campbell failed to remark the poems for which Vaughan is now best known; only one, *The Timber*, was characteristic of Vaughan's essential gift.

It is pertinent to consider the date of Campbell's *Specimens*—1819. The poems of Wordsworth which are said to have been influenced by Vaughan were all published before 1815; most of them were written in the first decade of the nineteenth century. Wordsworth, if he were affected by Vaughan, must have discovered the poet for himself; one might well expect some mention of such a discovery in Wordsworth's letters. Such is not the case, even when the publication of Bernard Barton's *Poetic Vigils* (1824) offered a suitable occasion for such a reference. Barton, a gentle Quaker, wrote a good deal of mediocre devotional verse. His simplicity and goodness of heart rather than his poetry gained the respect of Wordsworth and Lamb. For *Poetic Vigils*, Barton chose a motto from Vaughan's *The Night* and included a modernization of *Son-Days* in the same volume. Copies were duly dispatched to Wordsworth and Lamb, but in their letters acknowledging the gifts neither mentioned the poet Vaughan. It would seem probable if Wordsworth had been interested in Vaughan at one time, inspired

by Vaughan as Trench and others have maintained, that he would have made some comment upon Barton's interest in the same poet.

Even so late as 1837 Vaughan was still comparatively unknown. In that year Edward Fitzgerald wrote to his old friend John Allen, with whom he had long been in the habit of communicating his discoveries among the sweet singers of the seventeenth century: "And now, Sir, when you next go to the British Museum, look for a Poet named Vaughan. Do you know him? I read some fine sacred poems of his in a Collection of John Mitford's: he selects them from a book of Vaughan's called *Silex Scintillans*, 1621 [*sic*]. He seems to have great fancy and fervour and some deep thought. Yet many of the things are in the tricky spirit of that time; but there is a little Poem beginning 'They are all gone into a World of Light' [*sic*] etc., which shews him to be capable of much."¹ Mitford's *Sacred Specimens* (1827) included a number of Vaughan's now well-known poems and was the first anthology to give any adequate introduction to his poetry.

In 1847, ten years after Fitzgerald's recognition of Vaughan's poetic merits, the Rev. H. F. Lyte published the first modern reprint of Vaughan, *The Sacred Poems and Private Ejaculations of Henry Vaughan*, which made available the whole of *Silex Scintillans* (1655) and the devotional pieces from *Thalia Rediviva*. Vaughan's poetry need no longer be judged by partial and often inaccurate quotations, but it must be admitted that Lyte's edition caused no comment in the critical and literary magazines during the years 1847-1860. However, there were purchasers, for in 1856 an American edition appeared, and in 1858 Lyte revised his text for a second English edition. But Lyte's reprint came too late to have any effect upon Wordsworth.

In 1834 Robert Willmott, writing for an audience interested chiefly in religious poets, singled out *The Retreat* for particular comment, which is not without interest in connection with Wordsworth and Vaughan: "These lines will find an echo in many bosoms, for the same aspiration must have risen to the lips of every one. But we know that 'the enlightened spirit' belongs to the maturity of age rather than to the inexperienced innocence of childhood."² In his essay Willmott did not suggest that there was any likeness between Vaughan and Wordsworth, and his comment does

¹ W. A. Wright, *Letters of Edward Fitzgerald*, i, 46.

² R. E. A. Willmott, *Lives of the Sacred Poets*, 293.

show that, among the orthodox at least, the Wordsworthian glorification of the innocence and spirituality of the child, in which Vaughan also believed, had not yet met with approval.

In the year 1861 Vaughan's name was first coupled with Wordsworth's by John Brown, the literary doctor of Edinburgh: "He is one of the earliest of our poets who treat external nature subjectively rather than objectively, in which he was followed by Gray (especially in his letters) and Collins and Cowper, and in some measure by Warton, until it reached its consummation and perhaps its excess, in Wordsworth."¹ But even here there is no suggestion that Wordsworth was actually influenced by Vaughan. That hint was first given by Francis T. Palgrave, who included Vaughan's *The Retreat* in his thrice-sifted garner of the first-rate. Palgrave in a note on that poem in the first edition of *The Golden Treasury* (1863) wrote: "Vaughan's beautiful though quaint verses should be compared with Wordsworth's *Ode*." In later editions the adjective *quaint* disappeared.

Palgrave's suggestive little note to *The Retreat* was not long in bearing fruit. George Macdonald in *England's Antiphon* (1868) made a comparison between that poem and the *Ode*, with this caution, however, to his readers: "Whether *The Retreat* suggested the form of the *Ode* is not of much consequence, for the *Ode* is the outcome at once and essence of all Wordsworth's theories; and whatever he may have drawn from *The Retreat* is glorified in the *Ode*. Still it is interesting to compare them."² Archbishop Trench in *A Household Book of English Poetry* published in the same year, in a note on *The Retreat* also pointed out the resemblance: "I do not mean that Wordsworth had ever seen this poem when he wrote his. The coincidences are so remarkable that it is certainly difficult to esteem them accidental; but Wordsworth was so little a reader of anything out of the way, and at the time his *Ode* was composed, the *Silex Scintillans* was altogether out of the way, a book of such excessive rarity, that an explanation of the points of contact must be sought elsewhere."³ Neither Macdonald nor Trench, and both were well read in English literature, is yet ready to accept the idea that Wordsworth knew Vaughan, but they are in a receptive mood to accept any proof, however slight, which would establish a connection between the two poets.

¹ John Brown, *Horæ Subsecivæ*, ii, 20.

² P. 255.

³ P. 410.

The "proof" was not long in coming. On July 13, 1869, Archbishop Trench received a letter from which he quotes in the second edition of his *Household Book*, where, in his comments on *The Retreat*, he repeats his note of the 1868 edition and adds: "That this was too rashly spoken I have since had proof. A correspondent, with date July 13, 1869, has written to me, 'I have a copy of the first edition of the *Silex*, incomplete and very much damp-stained, which I bought in a lot with several books at the poet Wordsworth's sale.'"¹ The correspondent remained unnamed, nor does Archbishop Trench seem to have made any effort to examine this copy. He had corresponded the previous July with a Mr. Frank Millson, the owner of several early editions of Vaughan, about the relationship between the 1650 and 1655 editions of the *Silex Scintillans*, but *The Letters and Memorials of Richard Chenevix Trench* contain no further information in this connection. Upon this quotation from the letter of the unknown correspondent the entire legend of Wordsworth's indebtedness to Vaughan depends. The evidence is meagre enough; unless unpublished correspondence can be found which will throw further light on the matter, or the Wordsworth copy of the *Silex* turns up, the evidence as it now stands is worth little. The correspondent described his copy as a first edition incomplete; this raises the question of whether he meant a copy of the 1650 edition with pages missing, or whether he meant that his copy did not contain the poems which were added to the edition of 1655. He did not say whether the copy gave evidence of any use by Wordsworth, nor have we any clue as to when Wordsworth acquired his *Silex*. These points, which are of great importance in determining the possibility and extent of Vaughan's influence upon Wordsworth, have received no consideration from any subsequent writers on the subject, but the story of Wordsworth's copy of the *Silex* has received a number of additions. In all instances Trench is given as the authority, so that these embellishments are less to be relied upon as evidence than the unknown correspondent's letter.

In 1868 Alexander B. Grosart began work upon his edition of Vaughan, which was to be complete, containing all the known work in verse and prose. This elaborate edition in four volumes was published in the Fuller Worthies' Library in 1871. In a critical essay appearing in the second volume, Grosart quoted the remarks

¹ P. 411.

which Trench had made upon *The Retreate* in the 1868 edition of *A Household Book of English Poetry*, to which he appended the following: "His Grace subsequently ascertained and was good enough to inform me of it, that Wordsworth had a copy of '*Silex Scintillans*' and that it bore many marks of earnest use." Grosart apparently, did not see the 1870 edition of the *Household Book* where no mention is made of "earnest use." If Trench examined the Wordsworth copy and observed "marks of earnest use," it is strange that he did not mention this in his own revised note. There is a possibility that Trench saw the copy after the publication of his second edition and passed on this information to Grosart by word of mouth or by letter, but Grosart's next sentence throws grave suspicion upon his reliability. He continued: "The great Poet's Sale Catalogue establishes the fact: for there *Silex Scintillans* is duly entered."¹ In the reprint of the Sale Catalogue in the *Transactions of the Wordsworth Society*,² neither Vaughan's name nor the title *Silex Scintillans* appears; nor would a careful reader of the quotation from the unknown correspondent's letter expect to find them, for he had said that he bought the *Silex* in a lot with several books. The catalogue contains several lots which are not itemized; in such a lot the *Silex* must have been, if it was sold at that time. Grosart may have had access to a catalogue which was annotated at the sale with unnamed items noted in the margin, but if such were the case, he would scarcely have written, "There *Silex Scintillans* is duly entered." It would seem that in his eagerness to believe that Wordsworth owed a debt to Vaughan he allowed scholarly conscience to sleep.

One other addition to the story of Wordsworth's copy of Vaughan appeared in 1885 when, in the introduction to his reprint of *Silex Scintillans*, the Rev. William Clare wrote: "Since the discovery that Wordsworth had in his scanty library a copy of the *Silex Scintillans*, well read and with notes in his own handwriting, it is no longer a matter of conjecture that his thought was largely influenced by that of Vaughan."³ Since this exaggerated assertion contains one error in fact, the scanty library, I fear that the notes in Wordsworth's handwriting are pure invention. But the legend of the well-worn copy has persisted and turns up in various forms such as "much-used" or "well-thumbed."

Grosart in his essay on Vaughan also recorded his grief that

¹ II, p. lxiv.

² No. 6.

³ P. 8.

Wordsworth failed to mention Vaughan in his various prefaces.¹ This fact is peculiarly pertinent in connection with Wordsworth's *Essay, Supplementary to the Preface*, which appeared in the 1815 edition of his poems, for in this essay Wordsworth reviews the course of taste in poetry from Chaucer to his own day. He comments upon the neglect of the seventeenth-century poets by critics, particularly Johnson. To attest the former esteem of some of them he turns to his shelves and finds "Flatman's Poems, fourth edition, 1681; Waller, fifth edition, same date. The Poems of Norris of Bemerton not long after went, I believe, through nine editions."² Vaughan would scarcely do as an instance of popularity; later in the same essay, when Wordsworth is considering the dearth of poets who wrote with an eye "steadily fixed upon his object," he names Anne, Countess of Winchelsea as a notable exception. To be sure, in this section of the *Essay* Wordsworth was primarily concerned with poetry between the publication of *Paradise Lost* and Thomson's *Seasons*, and although Vaughan's *Thalia Rediviva* appeared within those dates, Wordsworth might, and quite rightly, have considered Vaughan as belonging to an earlier period and therefore inappropriate as an illustration. But no such disqualification applies to the *Poems and Extracts* selected by Wordsworth and neatly copied by Sarah Hutchinson in a small quarto bound in whole citron morocco presented to Lady Mary Lowther on December 21, 1819.

The dedicatory sonnet to Lady Mary Lowther was published in 1820, but its opening lines

Lady, I rifled a Parnassian Cave
(But seldom trod) of mildly-gleaming ore;
And cull'd, from sundry beds, a lucid store
Of genuine crystals,

awaited elucidation until 1905, when the *Poems and Extracts* was first published. It would seem that Wordsworth's original intention had been to make a selection from Anne, Countess of Winchelsea only, for thirty-two of the ninety-two pages of the manuscript are occupied with extracts from her poems. Lady Anne was indeed Wordsworth's discovery, and he was ever eager to speak of one who in a far less degree than Vaughan anticipates himself. It is impossible for me to believe that Wordsworth knew Vaughan at this

¹ II, p. lxxviii.

² *Poems of William Wordsworth*, Oxford Standard Poets, 947.

date; if he had, Vaughan's inclusion in this collection would have been inevitable. The selections range from Shakespeare through the eighteenth century. Even Alexander Pope, when he writes with his "eye upon the object," is included. Among the seventeenth-century writers, Wither, Marvell, Carew, and Samuel Daniel are drawn upon. The little quarto illustrates Wordsworth's theories about poetry, but more than that it seems safe to assume that it was an anthology of favourite passages.

An uninterrupted reading of Wordsworth's notes to the 1849-1850 edition of his poems reveals that Wordsworth was most meticulous in acknowledging any borrowing from other poets: for example, in a note to line 81 of *Guilt and Sorrow*, he indicates that it was suggested by "a short MS. poem by one Charles Farish, long since deceased"; in a note on the sonnet to Zaragoza, he is careful to acknowledge "some obligations to one of an Italian, to which I cannot refer." The origin and inspiration for many of his poems is carefully related. From this one must assume that if Wordsworth were influenced by Vaughan, he deliberately and carefully concealed his debt; a theory which is untenable in the light of Wordsworth's generous recognition of the books and people that helped to form his mind, not only revealed in these notes but in *The Prelude*.

One other source, perhaps the best one of all, Dorothy Wordsworth's *Journals*, fails to reveal any trace of Vaughan. This evidence, although it is of a negative character, becomes compelling when to the complete silence of Dorothy and William Wordsworth is added the absence of any reference to Vaughan in the letters of Coleridge and Lamb. Both Lamb and Coleridge were fairly loquacious upon the subject of their reading and quick to communicate any discoveries which they might make to each other and to the Wordsworths. Wordsworth was not so prone to write about his reading, but it is difficult to believe that Wordsworth should have read Vaughan with sufficient attention to have been influenced by Vaughan to the degree that parallel passages in the poetry of the two men would suggest, without some mention of this new poet having crept into the letters of this group, and particularly into Dorothy's *Journals*.

Whatever case is to be made for Vaughan's influence upon Wordsworth must rest upon internal evidence. A fact often overlooked by those seeking parallel passages in the poetry of the two

men is that Wordsworth could have known only those poems published in the *Silex Scintillans*, 1650, for it was presumably this edition which was purchased by the unknown correspondent. It is a strange fact that a number of Vaughan's poems, *Childhood*, *The Stone*, *The Water-fall*, and *The Bird*, for which striking parallels can be found in poems by Wordsworth, appear in the second part of *Silex Scintillans* (1655) and consequently would not have been known to Wordsworth. This should be borne in mind when considering the similarities between *The Retreat* and *Intimations of Immortality*, for it suggests, as Archbishop Trench first pointed out, that the "points of contact between the poems must be sought elsewhere."

A number of writers on Vaughan, including George Macdonald, Professor John Campbell Shairp, Miss Louise Imogen Guiney, and Sir Edmund K. Chambers, have considered the relationship between Vaughan and Wordsworth and were inclined to find in *The Retreat* the germ of Wordsworth's *Ode*. L. R. Merrill, in a paper printed in *Modern Language Notes* (1922), attempted an orderly paralleling of passages from the *Ode* with passages which are to be found in those of Vaughan's poems to which Wordsworth might have had access. Mr. Merrill first briefly considers a few parallels from other poems by Wordsworth, but he rests his case chiefly upon the parallels between *The Retreat* and the *Ode*. He believes that the opening lines of the former,

Happy those early dayes ! when I
Shin'd in my Angell-infancy.
Before I understood this place
Appointed for my second race,
Or taught my soul to fancy ought
But a white, Celestiall thought.

inspired the opening lines of the *Ode* :

There was a time when meadow, grove, and stream,
The earth, and every common sight,
To me did seem
Apparelled in celestial light.

There is some similarity in thought, and here occurs the only verbal echo, if such it may be called, which has yet been pointed out, in the word "celestial" used of the new-born soul by Vaughan, by Wordsworth of the external world. Mr. Merrill suggests that Vaughan's

But felt through all this fleshly dresse
Bright shootes of everlastingnesse.

inspired Wordsworth's

that in our embers
Is something that doth live,
That nature yet remembers
What was so fugitive !

These passages are scarcely parallel ; a line from Coleridge's *Sonnet*, written when he heard of the birth of his first son,

some have said
We lived ere yet this fleshly robe we wore

is far closer to Vaughan's lines than any from Wordsworth. Happily Coleridge supplied a footnote to his line referring the reader to Plato's *Phædrus*. The three poets have drawn from a common source. Mr. Merrill gives examples of other parallels, but as they are no more convincing than the two I have cited, I will not repeat them here.

None of the parallel passages pointed out by Merrill or his predecessors are sufficiently close to justify the statement that Wordsworth's *Ode* had its origin in Vaughan's *The Retreat*, unless that claim can be substantiated by external evidence. A comparison of the two poems also reveals differences at the very points where the likenesses are found. In Vaughan one finds no insistence upon "the simple creed of Childhood"; the epithet "Angell-infancy," considered in its context, implies no more than that the soul in infancy is nearer to God, since it has just parted from its celestial home. As the babe grows older, he travels away from God on his earthly orbit : for this life to Vaughan is like a great circle ; birth and death begin at the same point. Death is to be eagerly sought that the individual may rejoin God :

But I by backward steps would move
And when this dust falls to the urn
In that state I came return.

In Wordsworth's *Ode* there is no such confidence in the idea of a return ; life to him was not a great circular journey from a home which will be safely reattained through the mercy of Christ, but a progressive evolution from one state to another during which the spirit is encouraged to believe in its immortality by recollections of childhood when common sights were "apparelled in celestial light."

Unfortunately for those who wish to see in *The Retreat* the germ of the *Ode*, Dorothy Wordsworth's *Journals* record some valuable clues which indicate that the inspiration of the *Ode* is to

be found elsewhere. Mr. Herbert Hartman, in an article in the *Review of English Studies* (1930), "The 'Intimations' of Wordsworth's Ode," has carefully traced the inception and progress of the *Ode*. Although one may not be willing to accept his proof of the point in which he is particularly concerned, namely, that Wordsworth erred in the note on the *Ode* dictated to Miss Fenwick when he said that four years intervened between the composition of the first four sections and the remainder of the poem; yet Mr. Hartman's array of facts, drawn from Dorothy's *Journals*, prove conclusively that the *Ode* owed its origin and completion to conversations between Coleridge and Wordsworth.

It is even possible that Wordsworth in his youth might have failed to appreciate Vaughan's poems, for there are elements in Vaughan which would not have pleased the young Wordsworth. They meet in nature, a nature which is animated by the spirit of God in the case of Vaughan, by the "active principle" in the case of Wordsworth. Wordsworth in his young manhood was what Coleridge called "at least a semi-atheist"¹ and might easily have been put off by Vaughan's fondness for essentially Christian, almost Catholic, imagery. Vaughan is a Christian mystic; the great fact of his life is God, the God revealed to the Hebrews and the early Christians. Vaughan is not a pantheist seeing God in all things, but a Christian who sees all things in God. The world is God's footstool, a manifestation, an emanation from God. Nature in Vaughan is never used as a synonym for God, as it often is in Wordsworth. The little poem on the text, "*Etenim res creatæ exerto capite observantes expectant revelationem filiorum Dei*" expresses Vaughan's pleasure in finding scriptural authority to uphold his intuition that all things are imbued with God's spirit.

And do they so? have they a Sense
Of ought but Influence?
Can they their heads lift, and expect,
And grone too? why th'Elect
Can do no more; my volumes sed
They were all dull, and dead;
They judg'd them senseless, and their state
Wholly Inanimate.
Go, go; Seal up thy looks
And burn thy books.

He has taken *res creatæ* to mean all things created, animate and inanimate. In this attitude toward nature he is more nearly allied

¹ E. H. Coleridge, *Letters of S. T. Coleridge*, i, 164.

to St. Francis of Assisi than Wordsworth. The last two lines of this stanza do suggest Wordsworth's *Expostulation and Reply* and *The Tables Turned*, but Wordsworth goes out of doors to "sit upon an old gray stone and dream my time away." Nature affords solitude and an opportunity for meditation, but Wordsworth never advanced further than meditation on the difficult ladder of the mystic. He never saw Eternity

Like a great *Ring* of pure and endless light,

although there are moments when he seems to have wished to escape the loneliness of his abstract religious belief :

Great God ! I'd rather be
A Pagan suckled in a creed outworn ;
So might I, standing on this pleasant lea,
Have glimpses that would make me less forlorn ;
Have sight of Proteus rising from the sea ;
Or hear old Triton blow his wreathed horn.

But even here his desire is pantheistic rather than mystic. In *The Prelude* Wordsworth describes his boyhood "fostered by beauty and by fear" ; like the savage, he was filled with animal joy by favourable or beautiful aspects of nature, whereas the unfavourable or grand aspects inspired fear which in turn produced his moral code. In *Tintern Abbey* he writes that he found

In nature and the language of the sense
The anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse,
The guide, the guardian of my heart, and soul
Of all my moral being.

This is not the language of a man like Vaughan, who built his life upon the *Gloria* and *Miserere*.

Since the internal evidence is far from conclusive, the one fact which supports the theory that Wordsworth was influenced by Vaughan depends upon the veracity of Archbishop Trench's unknown correspondent who claimed to have purchased a copy of the *Silex Scintillans* at the sale of Wordsworth's library. There is no reason to doubt the truth of his statement. Wordsworth may well have acquired the copy, but unless he owned it and read it shortly after 1800, its presence in his library signifies little in connection with the possible influence of Vaughan upon Wordsworth. That Wordsworth acquired his copy of the *Silex* at a late date, after the best of his poetry had been written and when his mind had become unreceptive to new influences, is borne out by a number of facts : by Wordsworth's silence upon the subject of Vaughan in his

prefaces and notes ; by his omission of Vaughan in the *Poems and Extracts* presented to Lady Mary Lowther ; by the absence of any reference to Vaughan in Dorothy Wordsworth's *Journals*, and in the letters of the Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Lamb. The fact that similar ideas are to be found in the poems of Vaughan and Wordsworth proves nothing more than that each in his own way was influenced by doctrines which have their ultimate source in Plato. The parallel passages which have been pointed out by various writers are not sufficiently close to be accepted as decisive evidence that Wordsworth was influenced by Vaughan. The explanation for these remarkable similarities is to be sought in a mental kinship which disposed them to a ready acceptance of the doctrine of reminiscence, to a faith in their own intuitions as opposed to the logic of reason. But more than this, both men found their highest pleasure in the contemplation of the external world of mountain and stream, of cloud and flower, in lonely wanderings in a countryside familiar to them from early boyhood ; both men were allowed to satisfy this bent ; thus, from the similarity of their everyday lives springs the likeness in many of their poems.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

THE PHYSIOGNOMY OF THOPAS

FOR many years *Sir Thopas* has been considered a burlesque of the metrical romance. More recently Professor Manly and Miss Winstanley have, respectively, seen in it a satire on the Flemish knights in general, with their bourgeois pretensions, and on Philip van Artevelde in particular. It seems altogether likely, then, that Chaucer's intention was to write a rollicking tale which would be a sustained burlesque on everything imaginable, from pompous Flemings to literary conventions. It is the purpose of this paper to attempt to show that Chaucer also conceived of his knight as a very effeminate creature who conformed to the physiognomical conception of the timid and cowardly man, and that he thus burlesqued the typical knightly hero.

Thopas, for example, was "fair and gent"¹ with "sydes smale."² In Metham's *Physiognomy*, based on the *Secreta Secretorum*, a clear explanation occurs of what the latter sign connotes:

The sydys, qwan thei be sclender and pleyn, thei sygnyfye ferffulnes.³

And Richard Saunders, quite in the medieval tradition, lists as one of the signs of a timorous nature, "The thighs small and slender."⁴ Chaucer himself supports this point of cowardice; he uses "gent" three times elsewhere, but in each instance he is describing a woman.⁵ Thopas also had hair and beard "lyk saffroun."⁶ Metham says:

Crysp here[s], the qwyche be namyd yelw, betokyn hastynes, couetyse, scarpnes, fereffulnes, and dysceyuabylnes.⁷

¹ Line 1905.

² Line 2026. *Sir Perceval* was "burely of body and therto rigt brade," (l. 269).

³ *The Works of John Metham*, ed. Hardin Craig, E.E.T.S., O.S. 132, p. 138. For the history of the influence of the *Secreta*, see Allan H. Gilbert, "Notes on the Influence of the *Secreta Secretorum*," *Speculum*, III, 84-98.

⁴ Richard Saunders, *Physiognomie*, London, 1671, p. 271.

⁵ Cf. RR, 1032, "Gente, and in hir middel smalle"; also PF, 558, and CT, A 3234. In *Sir Guy*, l. 4126, "gent" is used of a woman; on the other hand, in *Sir Guy*, l. 568, and in *Sir Bevis*, l. 707, the word is used of a knight.

⁶ Line 1920.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 121.

Doctors of physic were cognizant of the facility with which a man's disposition could be recognised in the face. As Thomas Vicary tells us :

The cheefe beautie in man is in the cheekes ; and there the complexion of man is most known : . . . And as Auicen sayth, the Cheekes doo not only shewe the diuersities of complexions, but also the affection and wil of the hart.¹

Thopas' will, then, must have been quite weak, for " whyt was his face as payndemayn " ; and his complexion is further emphasised by the " whyte lere." ² In the *Secreta Secretorum*, we find :

And tho whyche bene ouer whyte bene dredfull, like to women. . . . Tho that bene Pale and trowbely y-colurid, bene dredful, for thay berryn the colure of drede in thare farretes.³

While Saunders says of a high white colour :

'Tis true this colour is very fit for a woman, who of her self is luxurious and fearfull ; but not to a man, for it would speak him effeminate : *Arist.* in his *Physiog.* says, *Albus coler in homine excedens, demonstrat femineum.*⁴

The " lippes rede as rose," as well, serve to show that Thopas had feminine attributes, for the Middle English ideal of personal beauty required that a woman have red lips.⁵

Chaucer tells us further about Thopas that his nose was well formed and of goodly appearance : " He hadde a semely nose." The shape of the nose is discussed in Metham as follows :

And this ys a rewle,—that alle nose-thyrlys that be wyde and gret be more commendabyl, than streyt nose-thyrlys and smale ; and for this resun, the sygnyfyacionnys off bothe dyuerse, for alle wyde nose-thyrlys and alle grete, thei sygnyffye trwth and manfulnes off hert ; streyt nose-thyrlys, thei sygnyffye dysseyuabylnes, gret dysposycion to thefft, and ferfulnes off hert, and cowardyse ; . . . ⁶

There are only two categories of nostrils here : the " wyde and gret " and the " streyt . . . and smale " ; it is obvious that the " semely nose " belongs to the latter group.

¹ Thomas Vicary, *The Anatomie of the Bodie of Man*, E.E.T.S., E.S. 53, p. 41.

² Lines 1915, 2047. As Dr. Caldwell pointed out to Professor Robinson (see the note on Thopas in the latter's recent edition of Chaucer), in *Thomas of Ercelesdoun the elf-queen's* " lire was white as any swan."

³ *Secreta Secretorum*, E.E.T.S., E.S. 74, p. 229. Cf. Joannis ab Idagine, *Introductiones Apotelesmaticae in Physiognomiam*, Argentorati, 1630, p. 88 ; Metham, pp. 143-144 ; and " Anonymi de Physiognomonia Liber," *Scriptores Physiognomici*, ed. Foerster, Lipsiae, 1893, vol. II, p. 107.

⁴ Saunders, *op. cit.*, p. 187 ; cf. p. 271.

⁵ Line 1916. Cf. W. C. Curry, *The Middle English Ideal of Personal Beauty*, Baltimore, 1916, pp. 66-67.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 134.

There is additional testimony that Thopas tallies with the description of a coward. The very name "Thopas" has an effeminate connotation for, as Professor Robinson has pointed out, the gem topaz was worn by young girls to protect their purity; with such a name it was quite proper that Thopas should be "chast and no lechour." Even Thopas' horse was more fitting for a lady than for a knight who "bereth the flour of royal chivalry," for as Dr. Caldwell has shown, the elf-queen in *Thomas of Erceldoune* had a dapple-gray palfry also: Sir Perceval's horse, on the other hand, was "blode rede."¹ And not only was Thopas' coat-armour as white as a lily, while Perceval's was "bryghte and bloody"² (since he had lately come from battle), but Thopas emphasises his effeminate purity by sticking a lily in his crest. Further evidence appears in the last two lines, at the point where the Host interrupts the narrator:

Him-self drank water of the wel,
As did the knyght sir Percyuel.

But though Perceval did drink water, he was strong in spite of the fact:

He dranke water of the welle:
And ȝitt was he wyghte.³

"Good drink makes good blood" is a later crystallised form of the well-known belief which is implied here;⁴ and Falstaff's apostrophe to sack is another excellent example of this medieval physiology:

The second property . . . is, the warming of the blood; which, before cold and settled, left the liver white and pale, which is the badge of pusillanimity and cowardice; . . .⁵

The narrative itself bears out this conception of cowardice. As an instance, there is the humorous result clause in the following lines which indicates that Thopas' courage is not to be dreaded:

So fiers was his corage,
That doun he leyde him in that plas
To make his stede sorn solas,
And yaf him good forage. (1970-1973)

¹ Cf. note to l. 836 in Professor Robinson's edition of Chaucer. *Perceval*, l. 1101.

² Line 1099.

³ *Sir Perceval*, ll. 7-8.

⁴ Cf. M. P. Tilley, "Good Wine Makes Good Blood," *MLN*, 39: 153-155. Also, *Tamburlaine Part Two*, ll. 3297-3298, "aiery wine, . . . being concocted, turnes to crimson blood;" and Andrew Boorde (*Breuyary* extracts from *Introduction and Dyetary*, E.E.T.S., E.S. 10, p. 89) has, "Wyne moderately taken doth letyfyate and dothe comforte the herte; . . ."

⁵ *Henry IV*, IV, iii, 110-123 (94-107).

Another example is the anticlimax in which Chaucer suggests the effect that Thopas has on women and children, the implication being that men do not fear him :

For in that contree was ther noon
That to him dorste ryde or goon,
Neither wyf ne childe.¹ (1994-1996.)

Finally, we have Sir Olifaunt telling Thopas that his steed will be slain if he does not leave the country immediately, to which Thopas replies :

al-so mote I thee,
Tomorwe wol I mete thee
Whan I have myn armoure. (2007-2009)

"Just wait till I get my armor ; I'll meet you here to-morrow." The giant will not wait, however, but gives chase then and there. Yet Sir Thopas escapes,

And al it was thurgh goddes gras,
And thurgh his fair beringe. (2021-2022)

Chaucer here couples God's grace with the "fair beringe," namely Thopas' agility in making a cowardly escape, instead of with bravery, as was proverbial. Such a picture is tantamount to Thopas' shouting, "Fortune favors the brave," and then pricking away as fast as he can.

It appears, therefore, that Thopas is consciously conceived as a coward,—one who conforms to the physiognomical conceptions then widely current. Even in his exploits he plays the part of a fearful knight. There is, however, no consistency in the skit, and quite properly so. All sorts of incongruities appear : although a Flemish knight, Sir Thopas drinks water ;² although his face and skin are

¹ It is true that Chaucer says "noon" which would include men as well as women, but there must be some point to the anticlimactic last line. Cf. *Perceval*, ll. 1171-1172, "There was none that myght hym dere, Percevelle, that tyde," where there is no specific mention of women and children. Also climactic are ll. 1945-1946 in which the last-named animal, the hare, is of doubtful ferocity (cf. *The Huntynge of the Hare* [Weber, III, 279 ff.], in which the hare is so "wild" that it chases the dogs). It is especially significant, too, that Lyly, in *Endimion*, conceived his character "Thopas" as a coward, when we remember that this character came from Chaucer's Thopas (cf. A. Feuillerat, *Lyly*, p. 318 n., and Bond, *Works of Lyly*, III, 503).

² The Flemings, in early England, were usually known as a nation of toppers. Andrew Boorde says of them : "The people be gentyl, but the men be great drynkers ; . . ." (*Op. cit.*, p. 147). And earlier in Boorde's work one of the Flemings describes himself in these words :

I am a Flemyng, what for all that,
Although I wyll be dronken other whyles as a rat ?

white, yet he has a "scarlet rode." Chaucer seems to have taken a most unknighly hero, placed him in the locale of an unromantic land famed for its middle-class burghers, and related his adventures in a popular form which easily lent itself to burlesque.

CARROLL CAMDEN, Jr.

THE REVELATION TO THE MONK OF EVESHAM¹

MRS. DAVIES may like to know that the Latin Vision of the Monk of Eynsham or Enesham, not Evesham, exists in a score or more of manuscripts, and was edited, not for the first time, by Canon H. E. Salter, with much learning, in Vol. ii. (1908) of *The Cartulary of the Abbey of Eynsham* (Oxford Historical Society).

E. K. CHAMBERS.

¹ See *R.E.S.*, xi, 42, p. 182.

REVIEWS

Speculum Christiani. A Middle English Treatise of the fourteenth century. Edited from all the known MSS. and one old edition, with introduction, notes, glossary, index of names and quotations, a table, and appendices, by GUSTAF HOLMSTEDT. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford. 1933. Pp. ccv+346. 25s. net.

At the end of this sumptuous and impressive volume we are reminded in the usual official notice that "Some of the texts now being issued are naturally less interesting than those which claimed the first attention of the founders of the Society"; and again that "It is well to print them, as otherwise students would continually be wasting time in investigating their uncertain merits." Both of these statements are here especially appropriate: for the *Speculum Christiani* (now for the first time published in its completely English version) is in itself of very limited interest from any point of view; and yet none will deny the desirability of making it available to the ordinary student. The *Speculum Christiani* is a Latin compilation, apparently of the later fourteenth century, intended for the use of the less learned priests—providing them with simple explanations suitable for imparting to their parishioners, of the Catholic faith, the Ten Commandments (including a rhymed version in English which might be learned by heart), the Seven Works of Mercy, the Seven Deadly Sins (with comments on each in English verse), a typical sermon in English prose and another in English verse, an edifying tale suitable for pulpit use, a prayer in English verse to Our Lady, prayers at the Elevation of the Host, etc. It is simple, plainly orthodox, and typical of many similar compilations and *specula* of its age. The different parts of the compilation are of various origin and date—some of the English verses, like the attractive lyric *Oracio ad Virginem Mariam*, on p. 161, beginning

Mari modir wel þou be,
Mari modir þenke on me,

(which is fairly well known from other sources), having probably been in common use in the days of the compiler. In this Latin form, including the English material, the *Speculum* was printed by "Willelmus de Machlinia" in London, about 1484 or a little earlier (the edition is not dated), since this famous printer does not seem to have published alone before 1483; and during the next few years several editions appeared on the Continent, but with the omission of the English portions of the work. It is from this edition of William de Machlinia (now extremely rare) that the work has hitherto been known to scholars. It was for Dr. Holmstedt to remind the world that there was, in addition to the vast number of MSS. of the above-described Latin compilation, a version in which all the Latin portion is translated, together with the matter which was already in the vulgar tongue. It is this completely English *Speculum Christiani*, preserved in the unique MS. *Brit. Mus. Harley* 6580, that is now presented for the first time, together with the Latin text from MS. *Brit. Mus. Lansdowne* 344 (a better text than that found in any of the printed editions).

Of the English translation of the Latin portions of the *Speculum Christiani* little need be said. Its language suggests some date near the beginning of the fifteenth century, and its style a painstaking but pedestrian writer of no great individuality. Like the earlier compilation, the translation is strictly orthodox; nor does it omit or tamper with any of the matter. In the fifteenth century much was done by the orthodox, as well as by the Lollards, to instruct laymen through the vernacular; and it may well be that this completely English version of the *Speculum* was intended for the layman who could read. As Dr. Owst has recently remarked,¹ there is too often among modern writers a tacit assumption that vernacular treatises which speak openly of the shortcomings of the Church must be the work of Lollards: yet, despite the absence of any direct attacks upon the priesthood of the time, Dr. Holmstedt (p. clxxx) states without further elucidation that "The translation of the whole *Speculum* into English was without doubt the work of a Lollard." Now, as this statement is almost the only definite conclusion set out in the more than 200 pages of Dr. Holmstedt's introduction, it is a pity that space was not found for the evidence on which he relies. The reviewer has searched in vain for any passage in the text which even remotely might suggest unorthodoxy;

¹ *Preaching in Mediaeval England*, Camb., 1926, p. 281.

all the doctrines usually attacked by Wyclif and his followers are simply explained and accepted, both by the compiler of the original and by the translator, and no theological discussion is even implied. One striking example must suffice to show how very far from contemporary heresies were both compiler and translator.

The famous *Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards* as presented to Parliament are preserved in their original English in a MS. at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, written in or about 1396.¹ The fourth of these is a violent attack on "þe feynid miracle of the sacrament of bred," which "inducith alle men but a fewe to ydolatrie." Now the *Oracio ad Sacramentum* which opens the eighth *Tabula* of the original compilation begins thus: "Aue benignissime Ihesu Christe Nazarene, rex Iudeorum, uerbum patris, filius virginis, agnus dei, salus mundi, hostia sacra, uera caro, fons pietatis." This prayer the "Lollard" translator renders as follows: "Hayle, moste benigne Ihesu Cryste of Nazareth, borne kynge of Iues, sone of the fader, maydens son, lombe of god, holy hooste, sacred verrey flesche, hele of the worlde, wellc of pyte." For, indeed, to this simple translator the opening words of the *Quicumque uult* as interpreted orthodoxly in the later Middle Ages were fundamental, and he naturally places them at the beginning of his first *Tabula*, where he found them in the original: "Whosoever wyl be saue, it es nedful beforne all thynges that he holde the feyth of al-holy chyrche."

Dr. Holmstedt is to be congratulated on the general accuracy of his transcription of the MSS., though some may object to certain details in his method of printing the texts. There seems little reason for printing words like *hymself*, *forsake*, and *blyssydhed* as *hym-self*, *for-sake*, and *blyssyd-hede* merely because the MS. presents them with a space between the two elements; and this method of hyphenating has sometimes led to misprints not all of which are corrected in the errata. *Euyf-fare*, on p. 76/11, is *two* words in the MS., though these are written rather nearer together than is usual; and it seems that all the other MSS. (including *Lansdowne 344*, from which Dr. Holmstedt rightly prints the expression as two words) have the usual Middle English *euyf fare*; but, apart from MS. authority here, there would be something very surprising in such a compound; yet it is seriously set down in the glossary by the Editor! Again, Dr. Holmstedt's habit of inserting words

¹ Vide H. S. Cronin in *English Historical Review*, *xxi.* 292 seqq.

of his own to make the sense clearer, both in the English and Latin texts, sometimes may appear undesirable, as for instance the insertion of *or* on p. 178/1 in the phrase *the sacramente Christes body* after *sacramente*; for a change in punctuation would have achieved an equally clear result without unauthorized insertion.

Despite the elaborate and weighty handling of MS. relations and variant readings in the introduction and footnotes, the Editor has not found space for more than the most jejune explanatory commentary. Many of the notes are lexicographical, pointing out that words found in the *Speculum* are not recorded by the *Oxford English Dictionary* till some years later than the examples in this text (the *Speculum Christiani*, as shown in the bibliography in the *Supplement to O.E.D.*, was not one of the books examined by the compilers of that work). Lexicographically the *Speculum* is not of great interest; and, with the exception of the word *foluyng* in the sense of *gathering* (duly noticed by Dr. Holmstedt on p. 243), contributes nothing new to our knowledge of the language. But, not content with these meagre gleanings, Dr. Holmstedt has sought to give a new signification (p. 255) to the word *cloude*. His note reads as follows: "*Cloude*: Lat. *chaos*, which here and originally means gap, opening. The *N.E.D.* does not recognize this use." This strange interpretation is repeated in the glossary. But the text (pp. 54 and 55) shows that the words *the gastful cloude of helle* translate the Latin *chaos horrendum inferni*. The expression *chaos inferni* is well known in Latin for the pit or abyss of the lower world or hell: but *chaos* has clearly been taken in its other sense of *confusion* by the over-literal and not widely learned translator. Such an astonishing conjecture as *cloud* in the sense of *gap* or *opening* would, one may safely assert, have been rejected by the Editors of *O.E.D.* had they had the opportunity of considering it.

Perhaps, too, the quality of the English translation and its more literary aspects should have been touched upon and illustrated in Dr. Holmstedt's commentary; and the promise of a special paper on the method of the translation (p. 244 (footnote)) will be noted with interest. The probable close relation between the version of the Ten Commandments in *Speculum* and the *Towneley play of the Doctors* is discussed on p. clxxv (footnote) of the introduction; and to this might have been added some mention of other possible literary parallels and influences, such as that of the *Everyman* play, which is perhaps discernible in the description of the death of the

good man and his meeting with his *gud dedys* personified on pp. 48-49.

Like the commentary, the glossary is of the most meagre kind—only dealing with words which are thought to have changed in spelling or meaning since the fourteenth century. In a volume of this size and appearance one would have gladly sacrificed most of the completely barren discussion of MS. relations from the introduction in exchange for fuller commentary and glossarial matter. And this brings us to a criticism of the method of editing which may suggest the need for some modification in the general policy of the Council of the *Early English Text Society*.

The *Speculum Christiani* is a typical text of its age and class, and has little of interest or importance to add to our knowledge; yet it is fitting that it should be published. But why is it presented with all the apparatus usually given to a text of classical importance, at the cost of vast labour on the part of the Editor and necessitating publication at a very high price? The introduction of more than 200 pages contains full descriptions of the sixty-six known MSS., with a discussion of the language of each (in so far as the portions in English are concerned) and most laborious and entirely inconclusive examinations of their possible genealogy and interrelations. The English text is accompanied by a full list of variant readings (sometimes covering nearly the whole page as footnotes) which scarcely ever throw any light on the language of the period or that of the archetype; and no attempt is made to show which (if any) of these innumerable variations on a remarkably straightforward text have interest or significance. Indeed, in most instances the textual variants are merely the ordinary orthographic vagaries of fifteenth-century scribes—some write *goddes*, others *goddys* or *goddis*; some *but* and others *bot*, etc. While the description of the MSS. is accurate, the discussion of their language seems often too mechanically dependent on authorities. Small errors are frequent in linguistic matters, and nothing conclusive emerges from Dr. Holmstedt's descriptions. On p. xxi *mony* is described merely as "the usual Northern form," and on p. xxvi *dede* (pret.) is explained as perhaps an example of O.E. *y* becoming *e*. Dr. Holmstedt himself well comments on the results of his amazingly painstaking labours thus:—"I have, however, succeeded in bringing most of them (the MSS.) together into certain groups, though I have not endeavoured (for this would have been impossible and quite a

worthless speculation) to decide in what relation these main groups stand to each other and to the original. The material offered by the English portion, however, has not been sufficient for such a grouping, and so I have had to examine parts of the Latin text too" (p. cxxxiv). Though the Editor thinks that the original compiler was "probably a Franciscan" (p. clxxix), he finds the literal translation of the Latin into English on the next page "the work of a Lollard." A plain text of the two versions of the *Speculum Christiani* would cover some 100 pages; and this, with a very few introductory pages, is, it may be suggested, all that was really worth doing—and it could have been done at a very modest cost. It is also true that there are still Middle English texts of first-class importance which ought to be made available to students and which are deserving of all the elaborate apparatus which accompanies this text of the *Speculum Christiani*.

So long as the *Ancrene Wisse* (better known as *Ancren Riwle*) remains unprinted in its best version (the MS. at Corpus Christi College Cambridge) and can only be had in the rare and now almost unpurchasable edition of the unsatisfactory Nero MS. in the publications of the Camden Society; so long as *Lazamon's Brut* can only be studied in the equally inaccessible edition of Madden made nearly a century ago—and other important texts of outstanding literary as well as linguistic interest might be named—there must be those who will be inclined to accuse the Council of the *Early English Text Society* of some indiscretion in their general policy. None can fail to admire the splendid production of this volume, with its excellently executed facsimiles from MSS. and its high standard of printing; nor can one refrain from praising the care and thoroughness of Dr. Holmstedt's labour in the transcribing of MSS. which at times present technical difficulties. But when some of the best prose and verse of the Middle Ages fails to find a publisher even of plain texts, this sumptuous presentation of a relatively insignificant, commonplace compilation seems little short of extravagant.

C. L. WRENN.

Seinte Marharete þe Meiden ant Martyr. Edited by FRANCES M. MACK. (Early English Text Society, Original Series, No. 193). London: Humphrey Milford. 1934. Pp. lxxx + 142. 15s.

THE importance of the group of early West Midland prose writings which includes the legends of St. Katharine, St. Margaret, and St. Juliana has been much stressed of late. R. W. Chambers (*The Continuity of English Prose*) has written of their "literary excellence" and their significance in the history of English prose, and J. R. R. Tolkien ("*Ancrene Wisse*" and "*Hali Meidhad*," *Essays and Studies*, Vol. XIV) has shown that they are no less important linguistically. Since, except for extracts, most of these texts were edited some years ago, before their various points of interest were as fully recognised as they are now, there is a pressing need for new editions of them by scholars who are alive to their significance.

The new Early English Text Society's edition of *Seinte Marharete* prepared by Miss Mack is, in most respects, the kind of edition that is needed. It presents for the first time the complete texts of both manuscripts of the work (MSS. Bodley 34 and Royal 17 A XXVII); it definitely advances our knowledge of the history of these two texts; it contains a full account of the language of both manuscripts and explanations or discussions of many difficult words that occur in them; it supplies a Latin text which is reasonably close to the source used by the Middle English writer and is often useful in determining which of the readings of the English manuscripts are correct. If some points in the edition call for criticism, they are mostly matters of detail only and of minor importance.

One of the most interesting sections of the Introduction is concerned with the history of the two texts. Miss Mack shows that up to f. 21^a, l. 19, the Bodley text (B.) has been corrected from a manuscript closely related to the Royal text (R.) and probably descended from the same manuscript as R. Since this first part of B. can be shown to be less close to the original than the rest, and differs from it in some points of orthography, she deduces that B. itself was copied from a manuscript for which two scribes were responsible, the first being much less careful than the second. Both B. and R. at different times preserve the correct reading (often determined by reference to the Latin text). They must therefore have been derived independently from the author's manuscript or

from a copy of this ("probably a first copy"), and Miss Mack produces evidence that neither is descended directly from this common original; "in each case there must have been *at least one intermediate copy*." Her views about the relationship of the two texts to one another and to their common original seem well founded; it will be shown presently that her view of the relation of their common original to the author's manuscript may need modification.

The consistent character of the language of B. (cf. Tolkien, *loc. cit.*) compels the assumption that no great space of time elapsed between the composition of the work and this copy (c. 1230), and that the dialect of the original composition cannot have differed from that of the scribe of B. In the light of Miss Serjeantson's study of the West Midland dialects (*R.E.S.*, III.), Miss Mack decides that the scribe's dialect was that of Herefordshire, and she finds support for her view in the marginal scribbles which connect the manuscript with Ledbury and other places in that county.

She is inclined to believe that a single author was responsible for the three legends of St. Katharine, St. Margaret, and St. Juliana, but has an open mind on the question of whether the same man wrote the *Ancren Riwele*. The mention in the *Ancren Riwele* of "our Englische boc of Sainte Margarete," and the fact that the author had in mind the legend of St. Margaret in the passage in which this mention occurs, does not make him the author of *Seinte Marharete*, even if we suppose that it was this very version of the legend to which he was referring.

Miss Mack's treatment of the language of the texts deserves commendation not only for the thoroughness of the survey of the phonology and accidence. She recognises some unusual meanings (cf. notes on *bihalt* B. 16/29, *sihen* B. 52/11), points to several forms which have escaped the dictionaries (e.g. *eilpurl* B. 20/19, *wleatewile* B. 28/24) or have not been recorded so early (e.g. *iseinet* B. 54/8), and is not afraid to wrestle with difficult forms such as *keasten* (ON. *kasta*) and *o-midhepes*.

It is obvious that *Seinte Marharete* must lose a good deal by being isolated from its companions in MS. Bodley 34. Though something has been done to remedy this by frequent references in the notes to the other works, there are many questions which can only be answered from a study of all the texts, and in some matters it is probably impossible to reach a final statement about even one text without taking others into consideration. There is, for example,

the problem of the relationship of MSS. B. and R. If we accept Miss Mack's views about the relationship of the manuscripts of *Seinte Marharete* and either Einkenkel's (E.E.T.S., 80) or Victor's (*Zur Textkritik . . . der frühmittelenglischen Katharinelegende*, Bonn, 1912) about those of *Seinte Katerine*, we shall have to believe that the B. and R. texts of the former are somewhat differently related both to one another and to the original composition from those of the latter. This may, of course, be the fact, but if it is not, it looks as though the last common source of the B. and R. texts of *Seinte Marharete* is further removed from the author's manuscript than Miss Mack thinks, and as though the B. and R. texts of *Seinte Katerine* are further removed from their last common source than Einkenkel and Victor supposed.

However, the editor of *Seinte Marharete*, who has given us much information about that text, can hardly be blamed for not having investigated all the texts with equal thoroughness. To turn to more legitimate criticism, the most serious is probably to be directed against certain features in the presentation of the texts. It seems unfortunate that it should have been thought necessary to substitute modern punctuation for that of the manuscripts, since in texts of this kind it is particularly important to know what is in the manuscripts. The excuse for it is, of course, that the scribes cannot be trusted to be consistent, yet, in spite of its inconsistencies, the manuscript punctuation is often a guide to the rhythm of the prose and sometimes to the sense. It is noteworthy that Miss Mack has to refer to it in discussing the correct interpretation of some passages (cf. notes on 20/21, 32/29, 50/16), and that when she departs from it the result is not always satisfactory. An example is the passage on f. 27^b of the Bodley MS., which in her text appears as "leowse þi fot þenne of mi necke ⁊ swa lanhure leoþe me, meiden an eadiest, þet ich eðie mahe, ⁊ ich mot nede. Noðeles min unwillis hit is, don þet ti wil is." In the manuscript there is a dot after *mahe* and after *hit is*, but none after *nede*. With this punctuation it would be natural to take *don* as dependent on "⁊ ich mot nede" and the phrase "noðeles min unwillis hit is" as in parenthesis, i.e. "and I must needs (yet is it against my will) do what you will."

The emendations introduced into the texts also call for some criticism. The principles which lie behind their introduction are nowhere stated and are not easy to discover. It would probably

have been most satisfactory to leave untouched the intelligible readings of the two manuscripts, and only to emend obvious cases of scribal error such as misspellings and omissions or additions which spoil the sense. Many of the distinctive readings are, in fact, untouched, but, where the texts differ slightly, there is a tendency after the first few folios to bring them into line with one another. A number of the additions and alterations introduced from one manuscript into the other cannot be justified on the ground that they are necessary for the sense and with several more, it is doubtful whether they could be so justified. Among the examples are R. 21/27, B. 22/9, R. 33/17, R. 33/18-19, R. 41/19, B. 46/17. In the first part of B. the additions and alterations indicated by the corrector and supported by R. are quite rightly not incorporated in the text, since they would have obscured the true nature of B. here, but if the aim was to reconstruct the original text, as it sometimes appears to be in the later parts of the work, many of these corrections would have been more justifiably introduced than some of the emendations mentioned above. Even in the introduction of emendations which are necessary for the sense there is some inconsistency. Why, for instance, is an omitted line supplied in R. 39/34-5 and not in R. 47/21?

The remaining objections, which are concerned with matters of detail, may be dealt with in a list. Some of them can certainly, and some can probably, be explained away as misprints.

Introduction, p. xv. "... positive evidence that B. was not revised from R. itself is found in 6² and 10¹²." In the last passage referred to the corrector has written the identical words of R.

Introduction, p. xx. "The remarkable affinity between MS. Bodley 34 and MS. Corpus Christi Coll. Camb. 402, the original *Ancrene Wisse*, . . ." In what sense is the word "original" used here?

Introduction, p. xxi. Miss Mack ascribes the scribblings that connect the Bodley MS. with Ledbury and other places in Herefordshire to the fifteenth century, presumably on the authority of the *Summary Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts of the Bodleian*. Miss Allen has recently stated (*Modern Language Review*, XXVIII) that the Keeper of the Western MSS. considers that they were written in the sixteenth century.

Introduction, p. xxiv. "But the *Sanctuarium* text does not differ from other Latin renderings . . ." The context seems to require "does differ."

Introduction, p. xxxix. *Schildren*, which occurs only once in B., is far more likely to be a scribal error for *schuldren* (cf. R. *schuldren*) than an isolated "Northern form" derived from ONorth. *scyldrum*.

Introduction, p. lxiv. The discussion of the weak verbs of Class II, which is based on Tolkien's investigation in *Essays and Studies*, Vol. XIV, does not, in one point, represent his statements accurately. Tolkien (p. 118) distinguished between the development of verbs of this class "after a long or polysyllabic stem" and "after a short stem, or short stem that received a strong secondary accent (*ónsdwërien*)." The second case is referred to on p. lxiv of this edition as "the case of a verb with a short stem syllable and *ónswërie*," as though there were no other verbs belonging to the *ónsdwërien* group. But cf. *purh-wuniende* 18/17.

Text, p. 20, l. 11. *þeer eau* is presumably a misprint for MS. *þe eauer*.

Notes, p. 71. In the note on B. 30/33, the sentence "wa me mine liues, bute ich hit am þet weorri a wið rihtwise" is translated "alas for my life unless I am the one to war ever against righteous men," which hardly makes good sense. The sense in which *bute* is used here is probably that recorded in *O.E.D.* under "*but*, 26, Introducing a reply to a question" and is there illustrated by the following quotation from the *Cursor Mundi* "Quat art þu, lauerd, sua vnsen? Bot i hatt iesus nazaren." It is true that Marharete's speech, which immediately precedes, does not contain a question, but it does contain an implied one since "ah cuð me þet ich easki" refers back to her demand that the devil should tell her "of hweat cunde" he is.

Glossary, *weorri*. Under this form, which is derived from "ME. *weorre* (noun) < North-Eastern OF. *werre*" are recorded the forms *wori* B. 8/4 and *wored* B. 36/10 (R. *weorri* and *weorreð*) which, as Tolkien has shown (*R.E.S.*, I, pp. 212-13), belong to a different verb and have a different meaning from the forms in R.

DOROTHY EVERETT.

The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales. A Critical Description of their Contents. By Sir WILLIAM McCORMICK, with the assistance of JANET E. HESELTINE. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1933. Pp. xxxii + 561. 63s. net.

THE name of Sir William McCormick has been associated with Chaucer studies ever since the publication in 1898 of the Globe Edition of *The Works of Chaucer*. The present book, on which he was engaged almost up to the day of his death, ensures the long continuance of this association and of the gratitude of all serious students of the poet. It is greatly to be regretted that Sir William never had the pleasure of completing his work, but we gather from Mrs. Heseltine's Preface that his wishes are substantially represented in this book; most of the material for it had already been collected and the plan of it had been so fully worked out that the only necessary alterations were mere "matters of form." As a result of his labours, which must indeed have been "long and arduous," we have for the first time, in accessible form, knowledge of the contents of all the known manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales* (fifty-seven complete and twenty-eight defective or fragmentary manuscripts), an exhaustive record of the arrangements of the tales and links in them, and a good deal more besides.

In collecting his material Sir William McCormick worked upon a set of photostats of the manuscripts generously supplied by the University of Chicago. (It is good to know that these photostats are now deposited in the British Museum.) Taking the Oxford edition as a standard, he compared each manuscript in turn with it and recorded all lines "omitted from, added to, or differing in order from" it, and all "variants due to omissions, additions, or alterations"; he also recorded many variants which may possibly be due to omissions. Other variant readings were mostly excluded.

This exclusion, though justified on the grounds that the record of all such variants would have swelled the book to an unwieldy compass and the record of a selection of them would have been "misleading," necessarily sets limits to the usefulness of the work. Though it is possible for anyone interested in the text of the *Canterbury Tales* to discover, for instance, the varying forms of the couplet

E 1305-6 because it is omitted altogether in some manuscripts, he can find out nothing about the variants of line A 1906. The book will not save any future editor the trouble of consulting the manuscripts (which is hardly to be regretted), but it will indicate to him the relations of the manuscripts as far as the arrangement of the tales is concerned. Further help with this problem is afforded by the "Study of the Links and some outstanding Divergencies of Arrangement in the Manuscripts" which has been supplied by Mrs. Heseltine. She has presented in concise form the information to be gathered from the collations about the occurrence of the links in the manuscripts and the positions assigned to them and has added statements about such matters as the positions of the "Modern Instances" stanzas in the Monk's Tale, and the forms of the Monk-Nun's Priest Link and of the end of the Clerk's Tale. It is, of course, exceedingly doubtful how far the relations of the manuscripts can be finally determined on the evidence of arrangement alone. Professor Brusendorff in his *Chaucer Tradition* speaks of the "mistaken . . . attempts" of some scholars "to classify the MSS., not according to textual variants, but to their arrangements of the tales and links." He may have expressed himself rather too strongly, but it is certain that we need to know, more completely than we do at present, the extent to which manuscripts with the same arrangement belong to the same textual tradition. In view of our inadequate knowledge on this point, Mrs. Heseltine is to be congratulated on her deliberate abstention from any deductions, on the basis of her analysis, about the grouping of the manuscripts. As a result of her restraint we have a book of a rare kind—one which presents facts only and withholds all theories.

Sir William McCormick has carefully preserved the spelling of the scribes, and since, in addition to the variants in each manuscript, he has noted the first and last line of every tale, prologue and link, a certain amount of evidence can be gathered about the individual peculiarities of the scribes. The capacity of some of them to spoil the metre or the sense or to maltreat unfamiliar words is illustrated by the lines (selected almost at random) "Whilome there was as an olde storye telleth vs" (A 859, MS. Cambridge Ii), or "Lordinges oure lordes name so mervelous" (B 1643, MS. Cambridge Ii), or "A pore widow sumdel stept in age" (B 4011, MS. Phillipps 8136). Such lines afford a piteous commentary on Chaucer's famous prayer: "So prey I God that non myswrite

the, Ne the mysmetre for defaute of tonge." Sir William McCormick was evidently alive himself to the dangers of "mis-writing." The present writer checked his collations with a number of the manuscripts in the Bodleian and discovered remarkably few errors of any kind and none of importance except that in MSS. Bodley 686 and Selden B 14 the first word of E 2419 is recorded as *Ey* whereas it is certainly *By*.

The book is not, at first sight, an easy one to work with since the signs employed to indicate transpositions, transpositions corrected by the scribes, fusion, and so on, become familiar only with practice. Moreover, though the abbreviations used for the manuscripts were adopted "in consultation with Professor J. M. Manly and Professor Edith Rickert," some of them differ from those used by Professor Manly himself in his recent edition of the *Canterbury Tales* (1928), and any one wishing to check by this new book the statements about the manuscripts made in that edition will have to provide himself with a brief table of equivalents.

Since Sir William McCormick's symbols correspond exactly with those used by Mr. Kase in his *Observations on the Shifting Positions of Groups G and DE in the Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales* (Three Chaucer Studies, 1932), which was based on the photostats belonging to the University of Chicago, it is to be supposed that they represent Professor Manly's latest ideas and will be employed in the critical edition of the *Tales* now in preparation under his direction. It is to be hoped that future workers on the manuscripts can agree to introduce no further variations into these abbreviations.

DOROTHY EVERETT.

Chaucer's Use of Proverbs. By B. JERE WHITING. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature XI.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1934. Pp. xii+297. \$3.00; 12s. 6d. net.

THE above work is a discussion of the proverbial matter found in Chaucer's works, this being divided into proverbs proper, sententious remarks and proverbial phrases. Dr. Whiting anticipates that his readers will not all agree with all his inclusions, and he has certainly

thrown his net wide. Why, for instance do ll. 2122-3 of the *House of Fame*, saying that the turning house

"Was ful of shipmen and pilgrimes,
With scrippes brette-ful of leisinges,"

constitute a proverb?

Chaucer's use of proverbs is plentiful, and it is interesting to observe which characters utter them. Dr. Whiting shows that they are most used by Pandarus, Cressida, the Wife of Bath, John the Cambridge student, and the falcon of the Squire's Tale. They thus belong to the more sophisticated characters; Troilus, the passionate lover, uses but four proverbs to Cressida's eleven; and one of these four (ll. 538-9), it should be noted, is in his soliloquy as reported (probably invented) by Pandarus, and should probably go to swell the latter's total of twenty. But, as Dr. Whiting points out, it is strange to find Canace's falcon, who might be the bird-counterpart of the pathetic and certainly unsophisticated Queen Anelida, in this company. One might suggest that Cressida's fondness for proverbs is not due to sophistication so much as to the fact that, finding it hard to make up her mind, and having (as Pandarus says), but a tender wit, she likes to have the support of some general maxim, such as

"Of harmes two, the lesse is for to chese,"

or

"He which that nothing undertaketh
Nothyng n'acheveth, be hym looth or deere,"

her two first citations.

Dr. Whiting examines the *Confessio Amantis* in its use of proverb material, and finds that here the proverbs are practically confined to the advice given by Genius, and are excluded from the tales. Where Chaucer employs them to illustrate the character of the speaker, Gower only uses them to point a moral; Genius "has no more individuality than a didactic manual."

Neither in his Italian nor his Latin models did Chaucer find precedent for his so frequent use of proverbs and proverbial comparisons. Dr. Whiting attributes it to French influence, more especially that of Deschamps and of the *fabliaux*, and is not inclined to credit the rhetoricians with any serious influence on him. In two Appendices the proverbial matter from these sources is listed. A full index to the proverbs is not given, as Dr. Whiting is engaged in preparing a dictionary of English proverbs before 1550, which will supply this.

MABEL DAY.

The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. (Student's Cambridge Edition.) Edited by F. N. ROBINSON. London: Humphrey Milford. 1933. Pp. xl+1133. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS is a most excellent edition of Chaucer, with more apparatus than has ever been included in one volume. Mr. Robinson gives us a good concise introduction, dealing with Chaucer's life, the canon of his works, and a Chaucer Grammar for the reader unacquainted with Middle English. The introductions to the separate poems give the general reader all the information he needs, while the Explanatory Notes give the student fuller details and up-to-date bibliographical information. The print is very clear, and much more pleasant to read than the one-volume Oxford or Globe Chaucers. The weak spot is the Glossary, which frequently does not correspond with the text in spelling, and lags behind the notes in utilizing modern discoveries. For instance, the Glossary has "Yve, ivy; *erbe yve*, ground ivy." But in the text "ivy" is spelt ivy, yvy; and "*erbe yve*" is explained correctly in the notes as *coronopus*. Similarly, "*vache*" is glossed as "cow, beast," though on p. 977 Mr. Robinson accepts Professor Edith Rickert's explanation of it as a proper name. "River" is explained as the sport of hawking in the Notes to *Sir Thopas*, 737, and *Troilus*, IV, 413, but this meaning is not in the Glossary. Words such as *katapuce* and *mazelyn*, occurring once only, have not the same spelling in the text and Glossary. Other suggestions for the Glossary are as follows: *Atyr*, *Parl. Foules*, 225, should be glossed "ornament"; it translates Boccaccio's "ornaments."

Leigh, *Troilus*, II, 1077, is referred to "laughen" instead of "lyen."

Roure, the noun, should have a close vowel, see *N.E.D.* It rhymes with "pore" in *Troilus*, v, 43.

Were should be "wære," according to the rimes, e.g. *Hous of Fame*, 979, and *passim* in Middle English. This seems to go against the suggested connection in *N.E.D.* with "werre," war.

Were, weir, should be "wære," *O.E.* wer; see the rimes to *Parl. Foules*, 138, and *Troilus*, III, 35.

Some omissions are: *brēde*, roast meat, *Hous of Fame*, 1222; in *steere*, *astern*, *Troilus*, v, 641; *fulle*, *Troilus*, II, 1036. This last, generally taken as an adjective, is probably an infinitive; cf. a similar passage in *Lud. Gov.*, 29, l. 1320, "Myn heed dullyth, myn herte ffullyth of sslepp."

In the list of vowels on pp. xxvi-xxvii there is an unfortunate misprint of "these" for "there" in the key-word giving the sound of ē. "Growen" is given as the example of ōu, but Chaucer rimes it with qu (*Cant. Tales*, D. 72). Also ou before gh had certainly two pronunciations, and did not always become Modern English ō, as Mr. Robinson says.

In the note to *Troilus*, II, 1025, "As make it with thise argumentes tough," Mr. Robinson brings forward a new sense, not in *N.E.D.*, for the phrase, viz. to put on airs, to swagger. The meaning fits III, 87, and v, 101, but he translates the present line as "Don't make a display by using arguments," and there is no negative in the text. "As make" is surely the emphatic imp. sg., as explained in the Note on *Cant. Tales*, A. 2303, and the sense is "Be persistent with arguments" (of the type of those in I, 466), *N.E.D.*'s sense (b).

Troilus, v, 53 "in rumour of this fare," translated "upon hearing of this behavior," would be better rendered "in the confusion of this affair," cf. the corresponding passage in *Filostrato*, v, 5, "non uccisa Criseida fosse in sì fatta divisa." *N.E.D.* gives examples of this use of "rumour" beginning from 1462.

With regard to the Note on Chaucer's translation of *pernicibus* *alis* by "partiches wynges," *Hous of Fame*, 1392, has it ever been noted that "pernice" is the Italian for partridge? Boccaccio writes in his *Ninfale Fiesolano*, stanza 101, of "la volante pernice cattivella."

MABEL DAY.

John Florio. *The Life of an Italian in Shakespeare's England*. By FRANCES A. YATES. Cambridge University Press. 1934. Pp. viii + 364. 15s. net.

THE scope and interest of this book are greater than its title suggests, for the busy career of "resolute John Florio" which brought him into touch with interesting personalities of all ranks enables his biographer to draw together many diversely coloured threads. The value of the book lies in the light it sheds on the late Elizabethan background which, in keeping with the biographical approach, is shown not as a matter of forms and tendencies but of personalities grouped in offensive and defensive alliances. As a picture of men writing rather than a discussion of books written,

this study, in spite of an undistinguished style, maintains a movement and flow which carry the reader easily on from the first chapter to the last.

Miss Yates' patient research has brought home much fresh biographical material. Among the more interesting new data are the account of Michael Angelo Florio (John Florio's father), the discovery that John Florio is to be identified with the "Joannes Florentinus" who matriculated at Tübingen in 1563, the reminder of Signor Gargano's discovery that Florio's countrymen found him a useful channel of information on state affairs, owing to his position as Italian tutor and confidential secretary to Queen Anne, and suggestions that he combined the business of intelligencer with that of language teacher and man of letters.

More significant than the biographical facts, however, is Miss Yates' new literary material, which bestows a livelier interest on Florio's minor works and enables us to penetrate to some unsuspected undercurrents in the literary world of his day. Among these may be noted the demonstration that Florio's *Second Fruits* was not merely a language manual but a contribution to topical journalism and part provocation of John Eliot's *Ortho-epia Gallica*, the suggestions that Florio was drawn into the Harvey-Nashe quarrel, that the ten manuscript dialogues mentioned in Florio's will formed the basis of Torriano's *Italian Tutor* (1640), and the identification of "H. S.," the editor of the 1593 *Arcadia*, with Hugh Sanford.

Perhaps most interesting of all, for its suggestion of larger issues, is Miss Yates' discovery that from 1583 to 1585 Florio was employed at the French embassy in London. He was, therefore, under the same roof as Mauvissière's protégé, Giordano Bruno, and the friendship between the two expatriated Italians left its mark on their work. Miss Yates records for English readers Signor Gentile's recent discovery in Naples of a variant early version of Bruno's *Cena de le ceneri*, in which Florio and Matthew Gwinne are described as the bearers (anonymous in previously known versions of the *Cena*) of Fulke Greville's invitation to the philosophical banquet described in this work. She suggests further that Florio is to be identified with Elitropio, one of the interlocutors in Bruno's *De la Causa, principio, et uno*. Florio, for his part, is shown to have recalled in his *Second Fruits*, perhaps with deliberately provocative intention, some of Bruno's scathing criticisms of English manners

and customs. Mauvissière's letters to Florio suggest that Raleigh may have been a frequent guest at the French embassy and, therefore, open up the possibility of Bruno's influence on the "School of Atheism." In addition, from the knowledge of Florio's whereabouts and contacts at this period, there emerges a series of facts, whose relationship is unfortunately obscure, which seem to have some bearing on the problem of the 1590 *Arcadia*. Florio is described in the *Cena* as Greville's messenger. Miss Yates shows that in the *First Fruits* he made an amusing bid for Dyer's patronage and that Bruno angled (less tactfully) for Sidney's. When, therefore, we find Florio, in the preface to his *Worlde of Wordes*, flyting with Hugh Sanford, editor of the 1593 *Arcadia*, and, in the dedication to his Montaigne, championing the 1590 *Arcadia* against its 1593 rival, it certainly looks as if he had some interest in the former and justifies Miss Yates' suggestion (strengthened by stylistic evidence) that Florio was the 1590 "overseer."

Some modifications and additions may be worth noting. According to Signor Gargano, Florio is not a Florentine name and Miss Yates is, therefore, chary of accepting the Florio family's description of itself as "florentino." Since, however, the name was not unknown in Florence (v. Blum et Lauer, *La Miniature Française au 15^e et 16^e siècles*, pp. 34-5) the Florios might have been given the benefit of the doubt and their Florentine origin accepted without question. It seems to me that the reference in the *Second Fruits* to "new characterisings," "twelve howres," "Calabrian wonders" and the supposed efficacy of the number twelve is to astrology and not to contemporary dramatic theory and productions, as Miss Yates suggests. The use of the expression "like lips like lettuce" by Sanford and Campion establishes no link between them, since the simile was proverbial and well known through Erasmus' *Adagia* (I, x, 71) and Heywood's *Proverbs* (II, vii). A similar objection must be raised to the stress on the phrase "dining with Duke Humfrey" (p. 184). The description of Hugh Sanford as "Coomflorio" on the title page of his *De Descensu* (p. 208, n. 1) indicates that he was a native of Combe Florey in Somerset and might, therefore, have been used to strengthen his identification with the "Hugh Samford" whom Daniel described as his "countriman." Sanford's pig and marjoram device was not mere fanciful invention but was based on the swine's proverbial dislike of marjoram. Whether this device was casually

or deliberately chosen is not clear but, according to Nashe, Sanford's "Sowe" was intended "sawcily" to represent "some great personage, what ever she bee." Here Miss Yates appears to see an allusion to the Countess of Pembroke (p. 206), but, if a personal implication was intended, it seems far more likely that the Countess of Pembroke was symbolized by the marjoram and the motto "non tibi spiro" (Nashe's "Go from my Garden go") was intended as a snub for the patroness of the 1590 *Arcadia* (symbolized by the pig), who is presumably to be identified with Sidney's widow.

If any general criticisms are to be levelled against Miss Yates' work they are of its style and occasional inaccuracies in details. The wording is often loose, diffuse, and vague ("higher things in the shape of discussions under moral headings with frequent quotations"). Mechanical formulas ("It is also worth pointing out . . .," etc.) tend to recur. The sentence building is frequently naive and poor ("Cotton is rather more accurate but duller; his version was used throughout the eighteenth century") and references to Mauvissière as "very hard up," to Bruno as a "wandering soul," to Prince Henry's funeral as "a striking event in the reign," and to Walsingham's having "collected enough evidence to cut off Mary's head" exemplify an insensitiveness to verbal decorum which constantly jars. No care, in fact, is shown for linguistic precision or finish. There are also a fair number of small errors and inaccuracies: "who" for "how" (p. 42), "*Amadis des Gaules*" for "*Amadis de Gaula*" or "*Amadis de Gaule*" (p. 129, etc.), "*Rodomantadas*" for "*Rodomontadas*" (p. 210). "Manuscript" is abbreviated throughout as "MSS." There are also far more inaccuracies in transcription than are justifiable. The infallibility of the camera cannot be expected of the eye, but five or six errors in quotations of thirty lines (e.g. pp. 127, 341) are too many. In some cases—e.g. "predicate" for "predicato" (p. 10, n. 1), "Antechristianessimo" for "Antichristianessimo" (p. 11, n. 2)—the context ought to have indicated that something was wrong. The usefulness of the Bibliography of Florio's works is impaired by inaccuracies and by failure to record the copies used and the typographical distinctions of the original title pages. Here, too, as throughout the work, transliteration from upper to lower-case type has not been adjusted to Elizabethan practice so that typographical anomalies such as "Frvtes" have resulted.

In spite of these shortcomings the credit balance of this work is

considerable. There are inaccuracies, but the work as a whole is documented with thoroughness and care. The style is pedestrian, but the very absence of "fine writing" gives the work a matter-of-factness which carries conviction. It adds much not only to our understanding of Florio, but to our knowledge of the world in which he moved. The characters in the story range from impressive (not to say portentous) personages like Fulke Greville to minor but solid figures like the Rabelaisian John Eliot (very well worth rescuing from partial oblivion) and the pedantic and tactless Sanford. Without forcing conjecture into fact, Miss Yates shows us men like Nashe, Gabriel Harvey, and Florio himself as they lived from year to year, divided by acrimonious literary factions, vividly conscious of each other and recording the topical pressure of the events through which they lived. Miss Yates keeps her mind open to literary implications and problems; her book should stimulate fresh inquiry in this field. In particular she enables us to guess more accurately at the tangle of mixed motives—ambition, resentments, economic pressure—which underlie Elizabethan literary effort and critical opinion. In view of its honesty, solidity, and stimulating suggestions on a wide range of topics, this study of Florio was well worth doing and has been, on the historical side, well done.

Alice Walker.

English Restoration Drama. Its relation to past English and past and contemporary French drama, from Jonson *via* Molière to Congreve. By MARTIN ELLEHAUGE. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard; London: Williams & Norgate, Ltd. 1933. Pp. 322. 6s. net.

IN the opening sentence of his Preface, the author announces that "in this study of English Restoration drama" he has "concentrated chiefly on its evolutionistic significance." His book is consequently divided into three parts: "English Drama from the Elizabethan to the Restoration Period" (pp. 15-98); "French Drama previous to, and contemporaneous with, English Restoration Drama" (pp. 101-82); and "English Restoration Drama" (pp. 185-316). There is a bibliography (evidently comprising the works and editions used), but no index. The book is printed in Copenhagen, but the

misprints, of which there are some forty to fifty, are mis-spellings or omissions of no importance, though such words as "bobleman" have an odd appearance. The author himself is no doubt responsible for such slips as "'Tis a Pity she's a Whore" (occurring three times), "Justice Overdoo," "Zealous-of-the-Land-Busy," "the Restorations" (for "the men of the Restoration," p. 187), "Langbain, publishing his book in 1699" (p. 10), and the belief that "ravished" is a "technical term of the time" of Beaumont and Fletcher (p. 49).

The author's general conclusions in each part are sound, but his book gains the appearance of a University thesis from its exact division of each of the three Parts under chapters headed "I. Dramatic programme and external comment", "II. Form", and "III. Spirit"; the "Form" chapter being always split into sections of "A. Action", "B. Characters", and "C. Dialogue", and the "Spirit" chapter into from eight to fourteen numbered subdivisions. Admiration for Restoration comedy is evidently the reason for the book's existence, and is expressed in language which occasionally verges on the extreme:

In no other dramatic epoch was the art of speech cultivated with such enthusiasm and consummate skill, and in no other type, earlier or later, did the dramatic genius unfold itself with such dazzling splendour in the language. The Restoration profuseness in imaginative illustrations, fanciful similes, paradoxical epigrams, cutting repartees, etc.—which is but vaguely foreshadowed in the past English epoch—is not only unique in the theatre of the world, but simply stunning. (P. 241.)

This passage is not definitely limited to comedy, but it occurs between quotations from Wycherley and Congreve; and throughout Part III it is observable that tragedy and the heroic play fill a very minor place. The author takes a point of view strongly opposed to that of Jeremy Collier; he sees in Ford "an early rebel subjecting the current code of conduct to a rational and radical revaluation" (p. 71), and finds in the Restoration drama a moral courage and prophetic vision which anticipate modern ideas.

A few minor errors in Part III may be noted; the claim that "Dorimant in Etherege's *The Man of Mode* is loved by two equally attractive women" (p. 235) would certainly never have been endorsed by the dramatist, who gave all his art to the portrait of Harriet; and the inclusion of Mrs. Loveit in "a group of elderly ladies" (p. 267) is an affront to Dorimant and Sir Fopling. The omission of part of the speech of Old Bellair (p. 289) invites misinterpretation

of the following sentence ; and it would perhaps be only fair, if *The Spanish Friar* is to be cited as evidence for the weakness of the position of kings, to quote also, from *The Conquest of Granada*, the pronouncement in favour of absolute monarchy that ends with Boabdelin's

But kings, who rule with limited command,
Have players' sceptres put into their hand.

H. F. B. BRETT-SMITH.

Songs from the Restoration Theatre. Edited by WILLARD THORP. Princeton : Princeton University Press ; London : Humphrey Milford. 1934. Pp. viii + 138. \$2.50 ; 11s. 6d. net.

To anyone familiar with the Elizabethan theatre a striking feature of the songs on the Restoration Stage is that generally they were set by leading composers of the day. While the songs in Shakespeare's plays were apparently written to existing tunes or were adaptations of other songs, the Restoration Dramatists enjoyed the special services of such as Humphrey, Bannister, Eccles, and the great Henry Purcell. It must not be inferred from this that thereby the interest of the music was enhanced. In point of fact, before the advent of Purcell, the Restoration had not recovered from the blight which had settled on English Music after the death of Elizabeth.

That composers were at last able to find in the theatre an aid to their livelihood makes the period very important in the evolution of our theatre music. At first musicians were content to imitate their predecessors in providing airs for incidental songs. A master like Purcell was not long in realizing the possibilities and in *Dido and Æneas*, *The Fairy Queen*, and the curtain music for *Macbeth*, gave us genuine theatre music. Progress can be gauged from figures supplied by Professor Thorp. In 1667 Killigrew boasted that then there were nine or ten fiddlers in the band instead of the two or three heretofore. For Shadwell's *Tempest* (1674) the number of fiddlers was increased from twelve to twenty-four. In 1690 for Betterton and Purcell's *Dioclesian* the score called for the employment of an orchestra of fifty.

The lyrics themselves exhibit a reactionary dramatic tendency. Generally the songs were treated as incidental diversions, sometimes with no relation to their dramatic context and often written according to a pseudo-pastoral formula. It was left to Congreve fully to recapture as dialogue the incidental song in a non-musical play. Although it was sung off the stage and not on, *Love's but the frailty of the mind* (*The Way of the World*) was in its dramatic intention on the model Shakespeare had set.

Professor Thorp has provided us with a handsome volume containing twenty-seven lyrics taken from as many plays with copies of the original music. He has added a number of useful biographical notes which show much research. Confessedly his book is a collection of representative samples; it is not, and it does not pretend to be, an anthology of excellence. We have examples of Shadwell's stilted compositions as well as those by men more accomplished, including Purcell. The plays range in time from *The Indian Emperor* (1665) to *The Constant Couple* (1699), and they include four of Tom D'Urfey's whose songs were most popular. Rightly the better known songs and airs have been excluded.

As the songs and music are not easily accessible to many people, it is very convenient to have by one a representative collection in small compass. The book supplies a pleasant introduction to a study of Restoration Drama, and even for the desultory reader it can prove a charming companion. Professor Thorp would have added to our debt had he attached to each song in the Index of Songs the name of the composer.

RICHMOND NOBLE.

The Early Career of Alexander Pope. By GEORGE SHERBURN.
Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1934. Pp. vii + 326. 15s. net.

BOTH Alexander Pope and his biographer are to be congratulated on this book. Professor Sherburn's sympathies—almost paradoxically for one writing on Pope—are with his subject; yet one of the most valuable features of this genuinely critical biography is the restraint with which he states his facts, usually for, but occasionally against, Pope. "The life of a wit," Pope wrote, "is a warfare upon earth." He could hardly have foreseen that with him the war would still be dragging on in the nineteenth century, and even into the twentieth.

Knowing what he now knows after years of patient research, Professor Sherburn might easily have been led to turn his own formidable weapons against Pope's detractors, and so prolong the battle; instead, he has used his knowledge—and no living scholar knows more about Pope than Professor Sherburn—to restate calmly and reasonably the circumstances surrounding the poet's early career. When intelligence and research lie down together, as they do in this study, the whole world of humane letters benefits. More particularly, the reader of poetry should now be able to approach Pope without the image of a malicious and misanthropic satirist continually before his eyes; for, as Professor Sherburn points out with only too much truth, "few will deny that Pope's supposed personality daily prejudices readers against his work."

It is with the real and the supposed personality of Pope that this book is concerned. It must always have been apparent to some readers that the friend of such men as Swift, Gay, Arbuthnot, Rowe, and Parnell could not have been the splenetic monster he was so often made out to be. Now comes the twentieth-century scholar, gathering together the new facts which have come to light in recent years (such as those concerning Pope's relations with Addison), himself bringing to light (chiefly through a serious examination of contemporary newspapers) a good deal more of his own, and re-interpreting some of the old facts with a rare impartiality. Briefly, the result is that Pope's character is sometimes cleared entirely of a number of grave charges, and at other times, if his conduct is not actually justified, it is at least sympathetically and wisely explained. How numerous and how irritating were the attacks made upon Pope in his early years is here told fully for the first time.

Any faults in this book are matters of detail only. There are a number of small and apparently unconscious repetitions which Professor Sherburn would almost certainly wish to eliminate: they are the result, no doubt, of work spread out over "a shocking number of years," and of chapters written at different periods. I refer him, at any rate, for possible small adjustments in a later edition, to pp. 3 and 39, 3 and 40 (note), 29 and 34, 66 (note) and 75, 122 and 125, 145 and 273. In mentioning the weekly journals of this period, it would make for clearness if they were referred to by the name of their printer or proprietor; e.g. (*Mist's*) *Weekly Journal* (p. 233) and (*Applebee's*) *Weekly Journal* (p. 142). The "unidentified friend Harry" in the letter of Granville's on p. 52 was recently

identified by Miss Elizabeth Handasyde, with what authority I cannot say, as Bolingbroke ("Granville the Polite," p. 90). Professor Sherburn removes from Rowe the credit (or discredit) of the obscene but witty epigram, "On the Lady who shed her Water at Cato." On the evidence of Tom Burnet, who ascribed it to Pope and Rowe, he is inclined to give it to Pope, and indeed bases one small argument on the assumption that Pope had at least a hand in it; but the epigram everywhere passed for Rowe's, was printed in his Works, and was claimed for him by indignant dunces when it appeared in Pope's and Swift's *Miscellanies*. It seems a pity that Rowe's ewe lamb should be added to Pope's mighty flock unless the evidence is stronger than it appears to be. Professor Sherburn prints (p. 139) an interesting letter of the first Duke of Chandos preserved in the Huntington Library. The Duke had apparently been reading, as early as January, 1715, the first book of Pope's *Iliad*, and Professor Sherburn is inclined to deduce that "printed copies of Book I, or at least specimens of Book I in print, were circulated early in 1715 among prospective subscribers." It is possible; but it is more probable perhaps that what Chandos saw was a fair copy in Pope's or someone else's handwriting.

These are small points indeed. The important thing is that Professor Sherburn, by honest and exacting research and by the exercise of good sense and a scholarly intuition has done Pope's readers a service for which they cannot be too grateful. His book is about Pope, but if it enables readers of his poetry to think less about Pope and more about his work, Professor Sherburn will have done what (one imagines) he wanted to do.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

The Epistolary Novel. By GODFREY FRANK SINGER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: H. Milford. 1933. Pp. ix + 266. 16s. 6d. net.

THE author of this book begins with some preliminary observations about the transmission of messages on tablets of bronze or stone, and ends with such modern examples of the epistolary novel as *Show Girl* (1928), which is apparently "the novel in telegrams." In between those two extremes there is ample evidence of Dr. Singer's industry, but little enough of either scholarship or literary quality.

He writes, in fact, so badly that his book is a constant source of irritation. Phrases such as "this was tended toward," or "as the eighteenth century dawned and began to unfold," or "before all this had the possibility of coming to pass," or "a more elastic gamut of subject-matter," would be objected to in any context, but are particularly objectionable in a work of literary criticism. Inaccuracies are also frequent. Pope's friend, Henry Cromwell, appears as Dr. Cromwell; the title of "Pylades and Corinna" is given in two different forms on pp. 50 and 56. Defoe is credited, without any authority being given—no doubt Dr. Singer never imagined that one would be required—with the authorship of a continuation of the *Letters written by a Turkish Spy*; but on p. 59 it is stated that he may not be claimed as "an early epistolarian on the grounds of one brief work in letters." Since Dr. Singer has already mentioned *The King of the Pirates*, he has presumably forgotten about the continuation of the *Turkish Spy*. On p. 45 John Ozell is referred to as "Mr. Ozell"—apparently because he is so called in the title-page of the volume referred to, and Dr. Singer has not been sufficiently curious to find out his Christian name. Again, what sort of public has he in mind when he refers to "the celebrated Alexander Pope (1688-1744)"; or when (even for the reasons he gives) he includes a summary of Richardson's novels extending to almost ten pages? On p. 63 there is an interesting suggestion that the sentimental plays of the early eighteenth century, "extremely slow in action, slow in plot development . . . were really essays in dramatic form or already sentimental novels"; but such gleams are rare. Readers of this book, however, will find extensive bibliographies of the epistolary novels not only of England, but also of France, Italy, and America.

J. R. S.

The Monthly Review. First Series, 1749-1789. Indexes of Contributors and Articles. By BENJAMIN CHRISTIE NANGLE. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1934. Pp. xvi + 256. 15s. net.

RALPH GRIFFITHS, who founded the *Monthly Review* in 1749, continued to edit it till his death in 1803; and his own file of the *Monthly* is preserved in the Bodleian, with the initial letters, or an

abbreviation, of each contributor's name inserted by him at the end of almost every article. In the *Review of English Studies* for April, 1931 (Vol. VII, pp. 168-81), Mr. Aubrey Hawkins identified some of those contributors for the first time from Griffiths' file, notably George Colman, who appears as "C", "C-n", and sometimes as "Col-n". Now comes Professor Nangle (who was apparently at work quite independently on the same problem) with a complete index of both contributors and articles, supplemented by such biographical information as is necessary. It will be obvious that identification was sometimes quite simple, at other times extremely difficult. It is true that Professor Nangle was able to consult Griffiths' correspondence in the Bodleian, but for the minor names he has often had to fall back on his own knowledge of the literary world of Griffiths' day. One is grateful to him for proceeding so resolutely with a task that must sometimes have proved wearisome. It would have been much easier—and almost quite useless—to write a prattling "survey" or "study" of Griffiths and his associates on the *Monthly Review*. Instead of that, he has produced a most useful work of reference; and if in the upshot there are several pages on which fewer words are visible than figures, the answer must be that this is a work to be consulted rather than read. Incidentally, however, he does find time in his preface for a convincing defence of Griffiths' character from the attacks of Smollett, and from the later and more sentimental complaints of Forster in his *Life of Goldsmith*. Professor Nangle's work is essential to any well-equipped library.

J. R. S.

Christopher North (John Wilson). By ELSIE SWANN.
Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd. 1934. Pp. xi + 255. Price
12s. 6d. net.

MISS ELSIE SWANN has been fully justified in her project of producing a new biography of John Wilson ("Christopher North"). The only previous full-length study was the two-volume memoir (1862) by Wilson's daughter, Mrs. Gordon. Much additional material on the period has become available since that date to justify a reassessment. Further, Miss Swann was fortunate in having at her disposal unpublished correspondence in the National Library of

Scotland and in the collection of the late Lord Brotherton. She has employed her resources with scholarly circumspection and she can write with imagination without flourishing her effects. Nor is she an advocate. Wilson, as a journalist on *Blackwood's*, sometimes employed methods which were contemptible, and Miss Swann does not attempt to obscure their vileness. This measured approach leaves one a little uncertain of her final estimate and interpretation of Wilson's character. She has no formula to explain his incongruous combination of robustiousness in life and personal generosity with meanness in standards of justice as a periodical writer. Can it be wholly explained by the buccaneering methods of early nineteenth-century journalism and by some conception that ordinary criteria of decency need not apply to anything to be printed inside a periodical? Even then it is difficult to account for Wilson's attack on Wordsworth or on Scott.

Wilson's public career is divided into two main activities, his work as "Christopher North" in *Blackwood's*, with the *Noctes Ambrosianae* as the outstanding contribution, and his long tenure of the Chair of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. His candidature for the professorship was a piece of barefaced jobbery in which Scott had his share, and, however much his rhetoric may have impressed his contemporaries, his contribution to the subject was negligible. It is here that Miss Swann's volume lacks a certain proportion and emphasis. She devotes a third of her space to the "Professor," and although she admits that Wilson was a journalistic improvisator masquerading as a scholar, she seems to suggest that eloquence devoid of sustenance has some value. At the same time she sets out the story revealed by the Brotherton letters that Wilson was indebted to Alexander Blair for the structure of matter around which his impressive periods could be constructed. As late as 1846 he can be found writing to Blair: "I shall be on Natural Theology for twelve or fifteen lectures.—*Could you write me a letter or two on Order in the Physical and in the Moral World? And on your ultimate belief in the Doctrine of Cause and Effect?*" In some minor details it would appear that Miss Swann, while using valuable unpublished material, has not made full use of the published material on the period. It is misleading (p. 31), in view of what is known of Coleridge's domestic life, to speak of Southey and Coleridge as dwelling together at Keswick in 1808. It was Coleridge who persuaded De Quincey against the Spanish journey with Wilson (p. 41).

Wilson's contacts with Charles Lloyd are not confined to 1808 (p. 31), and it would have been well to bring out his attempts later to assist Lloyd. No biographer who wishes to do justice to Wilson can deal as scantily as does Miss Swann with his genial relationship with Hartley Coleridge. Hartley was troublesome, but he gave some reward by his excellent description of the *Noctes*, introduced characteristically enough into a foot-note to his edition of the *Dramatic Works of Ford and Massinger*. This, with some other interesting references by contemporaries to Wilson and to his work, Miss Swann would seem to have omitted. She has to rely on De Quincey for impressions of Wilson's early life, though she does not appear to make sufficient reservation for De Quincey's untrustworthiness: nor is it clear that she has used the Boston edition of his works (1851-1859), which has matter supplementary to the Edinburgh edition (1853-1860). Her bibliography has no reference to Southey's letters, nor apparently has she employed them. Her account of the *Noctes* does not do justice to the positive contribution of Wilson to literary criticism, nor does she elucidate, as Hartley Coleridge did, the originality of their form. She employs the name "Wilson" and the pseudonym "Christopher North" without discrimination, although she explains (p. 109) that "the ideal character Christopher North was originally common property, but gradually became identified with John Wilson." All these are minor matters; the volume as a whole is freshly presented and is valuable in its exploitation of new material.

B. IFOR EVANS.

The Frolic and the Gentle. A Centenary Study of Charles Lamb. By A. C. WARD. London: Methuen & Co. 1934. Pp. xii + 230. 6s. net.

As a subject for books, essays, papers, and odd scraps of annotation, Lamb stands, perhaps, next in popularity after Shakespeare and Dr. Johnson. Yet, strangely enough, even the year of his centenary does not seem to have produced a really satisfactory biographical and critical study of the "introductory" type to which the best of the *English Men of Letters* series belong. Canon Ainger's rather parsonical volume cannot, I think, be placed among these "best"; and besides, it is half a century old, and since it belongs to the days

which knew not Mr. E. V. Lucas, is now decidedly out of date. Of more recent works, those I have seen are all either too short or, like Mr. Blunden's excellent *Lamb and his Contemporaries*, assume too much knowledge in the reader to be called introductions.

Mr. Ward's book has certainly a *prima facie* claim to be regarded as filling this gap. In spite of his unfortunate title, Mr. Ward does not fall into the hoary error of underrating the robust qualities of Lamb. His information, in general, is thoroughly sound and up to date—though he does not seem, by the way, to have met with the late Mrs. G. A. Anderson's edition of Manning's letters to Lamb (Secker, 1925), which would have enabled him to amplify his account of this little-known friend. The arrangement of the material is clear and workmanlike in its way, though I rather doubt the wisdom of dealing separately with the biography (Chapters I-VI, "The Man") and the works (Chapters VII-XII, "The Writer"); it involves some repetition which wastes valuable space, and such chapter headings as "Rosamund Gray—Children's Books—Criticism" may look uninviting to the neophyte.

Such indisputable merits and relatively trifling defects as these do not, however, really touch the heart of the matter. Somehow, after all, the book fails to satisfy; it lacks unity of *tone*. I do not think it can have been only an extravagance of zeal for brevity which made Mr. Ward give so little of the story in Lamb's own words, and certainly this will not account for his grotesquely inadequate treatment of Lamb as a letter-writer. The truth is, Mr. Ward has not made up his mind what sort of audience he is addressing. "Introductory" the book undoubtedly is in its general plan and execution; "psychological investigation" and "critical ingenuity" are alike disclaimed in the prefatory note. Yet many of the fruitiest stories, and most of the longer stock quotations, are (mistakenly, in the circumstances) left out; and the tone vacillates confusingly between traditional orthodoxy (with a rather heavy-handed, schoolmasterly touch occasionally, as in Chapter VIII, on the poems and plays), and a sort of scoldingly defensive manner (especially in the Prologue, Chapter I, and the Epilogue) which suggests that Mr. Ward believes Lamb as a prose artist to be out of favour with the moderns, and is trying to restore his tarnished glory. This notion is surely an illusion. With readers who really count—and I do not, of course, include those whose horizon is limited by the latest choice of some Book Society

or by whatever is on show at the local Boots' or Smith's lending library—Lamb's reputation is not in any serious danger to-day. His stock has certainly not "slumped" (as Mr. Ward puts it) in the sense which is perhaps true of the novels of Scott or the essays of R. L. Stevenson. In any case, since we are not told exactly who these mysterious "moderns" are, it is impossible to feel sure against whom or what Lamb is being defended, and these portions of the book give rather the impression of a wild-goose chase in pursuit of a quarry which after all eludes us.

R. W. KING.

Keats' Craftsmanship. A Study in Poetic Development. By M. R. RIDLEY. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1933. Pp. x + 312. 15s. net.

MR. RIDLEY has chosen for an intensive study of Keats's development as craftsman the principal poems in the 1820 volume: *Isabella*, *Hyperion*, *The Eve of St. Agnes*, *The Odes*, and *Lamia*; and has further included, inevitably, *The Fall of Hyperion*.

He has carried through with unfailing patience and good humour a close study of the text of these poems in the light of all the available MS. material; he has hunted down, with the valuable aid of Mrs. Ridley, also a devoted student of Keats, some interesting "sources" (and let us frankly sympathize with him in the pleasure and excitement of the chase); he has made a fresh analysis of Keats's metres, and he has supplied a commentary to the poems, which will help thoughtful readers to a livelier understanding of Keats's mind and art.

The unquenchable zest and high spirits with which he conducts the inquiry are a welcome aid to the reader, who expects a thesis and finds a readable book; but they betray the author into two faults or excesses: first, a certain carelessness of expression, surprising in so scholarly a writer; second, a form of critical baiting which Dr. Johnson carried to perfection, and which Mr. Ridley, much too sincere to imitate an old master, conducts in a gay, sky-larking manner of his own. The following comment on the "tremulous shake" of the poor Ghost's voice in *Isabella*—

As in a palsied Druid's harp unstrung

would be amusing *viva voce*, but cuts no ice critically: "We may resent the intrusion of the Druid, and wonder whether if he suffered from the double disadvantage of his own palsy and an unstrung harp, he could produce even tremulous music." *Isabella* calls forth the least happy of these jests: on the lines

When 'twas their plan to coax her by degrees
To some high noble and his olive trees

he comments: "*By degrees* is flaccid prose and the olive trees a most irrelevant piece of forestry;" but the laugh is on the side of Keats, who knows better than Mr. Ridley how the wealth of the Italian landowner is measured. And when he says of the lines:

Then with her knife, all sudden, she began
To dig more fervently than misers can

"the whole effect is spoilt by one word. There is no question of how misers *can* dig, as though they were being defeated in a digging competition, it is a matter of how they *do* dig, but the demands of rhyme will not allow Keats to say so," we must answer him in his own vein: misers are not diggers by profession, like gardeners or grave-diggers, but in moments of emergency they *can* dig—watch them when buried treasure has to be removed at short notice! A real weakness is betrayed in his readiness in more important places to assume that Keats is writing without any close sense of what he means to say—not a wise assumption. The critic's business is to grope after the poet's meaning, rather than to be facetious over a supposed absence of meaning.

In the *Eve of St. Agnes* with its interesting MSS. he finds his fullest opportunity of studying Keats as a craftsman in the process of composition, and his chapter on this poem is the most interesting in the book. The evolution of the text is unwound line by line and word by word with a skill and patience worthy of the delicate task. Two blind spots in the critic's vision must be noted. The theme of Madeline's undressing, so perfectly touched by Keats, is wrongly handled by this critic. When Keats writes (p. 116) of the "young virgins" on St. Agnes Eve that "superfluous to bed they must retire

And lay supine their beauties lily-white"

he sees what Coleridge saw when he wrote of Christabel

Her gentle limbs she did undress
And lay down in her loveliness

but Mr. Ridley blindly comments: "The phrase *lily-white*, which in itself is odd, since the beauties in themselves might as well be dark as fair, is perhaps Keats' adaptation of Mother Bunch's 'clean shift.' . . ." The other place where he refers to a hypothetical nightdress (p. 156) need not be quoted.

His "sources" are brilliantly worked and he gives an excellent lead to "Damosel Radcliffe"; see in particular p. 166 for the passage from *Mysteries of Udolpho* which inspired Keats's

Upon his knees he sunk pale as smooth sculptured stone.

But we would put in a claim for Scott, whom he does not mention: Canto II of *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* broods like the moon over *St. Agnes Eve*, and it were a shabby piece of ingratitude to leave Scott entirely without honour for supplying Keats with the best romantic features of a Gothic building by moonlight. The leading note for the exterior of Scott's abbey by moonlight is the strong light-and-shade effect of the buttresses:

When buttress and buttress alternately
Seem fram'd of ebon and ivory.

Keats concentrates this into one dramatic phrase: Porphyro is "buttress'd from moonlight." The delicate stone carving which translates natural forms into art:

Spreading herbs and flowerets bright
Glisten'd with the dew of night
Nor herb, nor floweret glisten'd there
But was carved in the cloister arches fair.

And the pillars with cluster'd shafts so trim
Seem'd bundles of lances which *garlands* had bound

passes into Keats's

casement high and triple arch'd
All *garlanded* with carven imag'ries
Of fruits and flowers and bunches of knot-grass.

The most magically romantic touch in Keats's Gothic scene, the colour cast by the moonlight from the stained glass window, is Scott's gift. Scott makes the point that the only colour the moonlight can throw upon an object within is the red of Michael's Cross in the middle of the window:

The moonbeam kiss'd the holy pane
And threw on the pavement a bloody *stain*.

Otherwise

The silver light so pale and faint
Show'd many a prophet and many a *saint*
Whose image *on the glass was dyed*.

The debt of Keats's window is registered in the "*stains* and splendid *dyes*" and the "*twilight saints*" of the famous stanza. Keats also adopted Scott's idea that it is *red* only, the red, in his window, of the shielded scutcheon (again set *in the midst*), which comes through as a colour on the shaft of moonlight, "warm gules" on Madeline's breast, "rose-bloom" on her hands, turning to "soft amethyst" on her silver cross, and "a glory" on her golden hair. That this is what Keats meant rather than that, as Mr. Ridley suggests, he wished to get a variety of colours from the innumerable stains in the whole window, seems clear from the first draft of the "Casement" stanza quoted on p. 149. The Bloodhound and his behaviour come naturally enough from Scott (Canto II, XXVII), and so does the hero's "lofty plume," though not his conduct of it. Porphyro

followed through a lowly arched way
Brushing the cobwebs with his lofty plume:

Lord Delaraine entered the priest's cell from the "arched cloister"
stooping low his lofty crest

(which is his "waving plume" in Stanza XVIII).

Mr. Ridley's analysis of Keats's metrical art, in spite of a few debatable points, is admirable. He establishes with statistics the good point that the Drydenian quality of the metre of *Lamia* does not spring from its avoidance of run-on lines; but in insisting that it springs rather from the absence of feminine rhymes and the new use of triplets and alexandrines, he leaves out an important point. What makes the couplets of *Lamia* chime harmoniously to the ear that knows Dryden is the subtly adjusted *balance* of the line—not obtrusive nor mechanically exact—depending upon a rhythmical, not necessarily antithetical, response of the second half of the line to the first half. Keats's opening couplet

Upon a time, / before the faery broods
Drove Nymph and Satyr / from the prosperous woods

is not so good as Dryden's

A milk-white hind / immortal and unchanged
Fed on the lawns / and in the forests ranged

but it belongs to the same tradition, and is set in the same mould. And throughout *Lamia* these lines where the weights are delicately hung in the Drydenian or Augustan places (note among other things the placing of the epithets) keep their hold upon the ear.

The God, dove-footed / glided silently
Round bush and tree / soft brushing in his speed
The taller grasses / and the flowering weed.

Striped like a Zebra, / spotted like a pard
Eyed like a peacock / and all crimson barr'd ;

and in very different mood and key ;

I was a woman, / let me have once more
A woman's shape, / and charming as before.

Mr. Ridley's study of *Hyperion*, and the *Fall* introduces a fresh critical estimate which has its own value and interest whether we wholly agree with it or not ; his interpretation of the first holograph of the *Ode to the Nightingale* is, we believe, probably right. Finally, he has conferred a benefit upon all students of Keats by his scrutiny and revision of the textual work of other scholars, backed by his vigilant reading of every important scrap of MS. either in the original or in photostat. His book is a good companion to the poetry of Keats.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

Swinburne's Literary Career and Fame. By C. K. HYDER.
Durham, N.C. : Duke University Press ; London : Cambridge University Press. 1933. Pp. xii + 388. 16s. 6d. net.

THERE are poets who do not lend themselves well to such a survey as is here undertaken, but Swinburne, the stormy petrel, is an admirable subject. And in how many ways Swinburne managed to arouse opposition Professor Hyder's book brings out very clearly. The challenge to accepted notions of religion and morality created a controversy which did not die down for a generation. His political poems antagonized one section after another, as he passed from "red Republicanism" to Jingoism ; and when he placated

the Tories, he alienated the Liberals by his attacks on Gladstone. He became involved in feuds with scholars like Churton Collins and Furnivall and, not altogether through his own fault, with men of such different calibre as Emerson and Buchanan. No wonder that even so tactful a critic as Dowden quailed at the thought of having to pass an unfavourable judgment upon him and that Andrew Lang refused to be dragged into a prolonged dispute with so redoubtable an adversary.

Professor Hyder traces the various stages of Swinburne's literary reputation, chiefly in England and America, relating the observations of the critics to the outlook of the age and showing the poet's reactions. Even before the publication of *Poems and Ballads* in 1866 there was more than enough opposition to disprove Gosse's opinion that John Morley's review was the prime agent in unchaining the storm. The sensuality of the volume affected criticism of Swinburne's later work for many years to come, in America even longer than in England. The republican poems once again caused a stir, but even on the publication of *Songs before Sunrise* there was some recognition of Swinburne's power, and the reviews of *Erechtheus* and the second series of *Poems and Ballads* were almost universally favourable. In the 'eighties less was heard of the moral charges against the poet, but criticism on æsthetic grounds increased and he was often accused of weakness in thought. However, his reputation was growing, and when Tennyson died various writers, including Wilde, Gissing, William Archer, and John Davidson, declared that Swinburne should be made Poet Laureate; some of his old enemies publicly recanted; and the new edition of *Poems and Ballads* in 1904 met with a reception which clearly indicated the change of opinion. Although a final estimate of his position has not yet been arrived at, his work has long passed from the realm of acrid controversy to that of dispassionate study.

Professor Hyder's book is a sound, thorough, and comprehensive survey, based on printed and manuscript sources. The labour involved in sifting this material so conscientiously must have been enormous, and the references in the sixty-three pages of notes show with what care the investigation has been pursued. Professor Hyder has added to our stock of information; to take one example, "after a long and almost hopeless search" he discovered the report of the interview with Emerson which evoked a diatribe from Swinburne. Not only is Professor Hyder an authority on Swinburne's

reputation, but also an appreciative critic of his work. His remarks on the poet as well as on his commentators are distinguished by their sanity and moderation.

These qualities appear likewise in what he has to say of Watts-Dunton. However, on one occasion, he seems too anxious to take up the cudgels on behalf of Swinburne's friend. Referring to Swinburne's poems on the Boer War, he writes: (p. 321, note 32), "Watts-Dunton has frequently served as a convenient scapegoat . . . for the poet's reactionary tendencies." That is true, but there is reason to think that in this instance Swinburne was influenced by Watts-Dunton. As far back as 1891 an unpublished letter from Watts-Dunton proves that his interest in South Africa was of long standing. He found fault with the articles in Chambers' *Encyclopædia*, which ignored Khama's country, dismissed Mafeking in a sentence, and were out of date concerning Kimberley. When the Boer War broke out, he was greatly moved by it. In an unpublished letter dated December 27, 1899, he said: "This war news is bad enough to make us all ill," and in another, written on January 27, 1900: "This Transvaal business sits upon me like a nightmare—it interferes with my work, & keeps me awake at night. I begin to feel the greatest contempt for the Government & every one of its members." In such a mood Watts-Dunton was not likely to restrain Swinburne's outburst of passion.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

The Influence of Flaubert on George Moore. By W. D. FERGUSON. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1934. 9½ in. Pp. viii+108. 6s. 6d. net.

AN ordinary critic who suspected a writer of being unduly influenced by some other would make a careful examination of the debtor—a thorough knowledge of the creditor being pre-supposed or there would be no ground for the suspicion—and would see how far characters and situations, ideas and attitudes, resembled each other, and if there were a case for borrowing or imitation would then be in a position

to establish it. But in these days of crossword puzzles, missing-word competitions, and Ph. D. theses, such a rational method is at a discount. "Literary influences," to use Mr. Ferguson's phrase, resolve themselves into verbal echoes, often more remote than those of Burton, Sir Thomas Browne, or the Authorized Version, to be detected in Lamb or Stevenson.

It is no news to any well-read person who knows George Moore that he was "a clever adapter of other men's ideas." Like Stevenson, he was an eclectic artist, with a much smaller fund of original talent. He imitated the Goncourts, Maupassant, and Zola. That was all Arnold Bennett meant when he called *A Modern Lover* "the first realistic novel in English"—a remark Mr. Ferguson seems to have missed. Undoubtedly his memory was well charged also with reminiscences of Flaubert. The closest resemblance proved by Mr. Ferguson is the pretty obvious one between *A Mummer's Wife* and *Madame Bovary*; but even here there is a concourse of other influences, and Moore's novel often strikes one as Flaubert translated into terms of Zola. The supposed analogy between *Evelyn Innes* and *La Tentation de Saint Antoine* is very debatable, except so far as it is a commonplace, the struggle between asceticism and the lusts of the flesh; and then, why not bring the *Thaïs* of Anatole France into the account? The tabular equation comparing the number of pages respectively devoted to each kind of temptation is surely criticism gone mad.

Most of the parallels filling out the book are open to Mr. Ferguson's own criticism: they are "merely conventional details expected in such a picture." He has struck a good one in *Vain Fortune* and *Madame Bovary*, where in each novel a person is engaged in dodging the bill-collector. But how absurd to remark that the mention of a woman as thirty years of age brings up Balzac's *Femme de trente ans*! Has Mr. Ferguson ever read the latter? His extraordinary French makes this improbable. He cannot even copy it out correctly, and his use of accents is deplorable. Here are just a few examples: "Je ne [le] crois plus," "ajou-t-il," "nausebonde," "azur" for "azure" time after time, "*Germanie Lacerteux*" for "*Germinie Lacerteux*" also time after time, "Appolonius," "un tog de lin" for "une toge de lin." Some one should have corrected his proofs.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

Letters of William Michael Rossetti concerning Whitman, Blake, and Shelley to Anne Gilchrist and her son Herbert Gilchrist. Edited by C. GOHDES and F. BAUM. Durham, North Carolina : Duke University Press ; London : Cambridge University Press. 1934. Pp. xii + 201. 11s. 6d. net.

THESE letters deal in part with the inquiries made by Anne Gilchrist when she was completing the biography of Blake which her husband had begun. It is evident that W. M. Rossetti freely placed his knowledge and his Blake collection at her disposal.

However, the correspondence acquires still greater interest after Rossetti's selections from Whitman's poems appeared in 1868. Rossetti's enthusiasm was great, but he was shrewd enough to know that not all Whitman's work would appeal to the contemporary English reader. He displayed a similar discretion when Mrs. Gilchrist, stimulated by the selections, wrote *A Woman's Estimate of Walt Whitman* and Rossetti arranged for its anonymous publication. The correspondence shows how Mrs. Gilchrist's growing admiration for Whitman led her to cross the Atlantic in 1876 and make his acquaintance. Rossetti and Mrs. Gilchrist were not only concerned with widening the circle of Whitman's readers but also with caring for his bodily needs. On two occasions they united in organising subscriptions to relieve his distress, and in 1885 Rossetti even appealed to President Cleveland on his behalf.

Incidentally, Rossetti writes valuable criticisms of his brother's poetry and of Swinburne's work, more particularly of the latter's *William Blake* and *Songs before Sunrise*. The letters were well worth publishing also, because of the light they throw on the generous, large-hearted, and at the same time tactful personality of Rossetti.

The correspondence, which has been supplied with useful annotations, follows the original documents closely. Only in isolated instances does one feel some doubt. Thus on p. 84, ll. 18-19, we read : " Whitman's paralytic attack did effect . . . the left side generally " ; and on p. 174, ll. 1-2, " next Sunday we all due to a very old friend." It is not clear if the errors are to be attributed to Rossetti or to the printer.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

Die Altenglische Version des Halitgar'schen Bussbuches.
(sog. Poenitentiale Pseudo-Ecgberti). Herausgegeben von
JOSEF RAITH. Hamburg: Henri Grand. 1933. Pp. xl + 85.
RM. 15.

THE Council of Chalons had, in 813, directed the burning of "Libelli, quos poenitentiales vocant, quorum sunt certi errores, incerti auctores": and the result of this growing consciousness in the Church of barbarian slackness was seen in the famous penitential of Bishop Halitgar of Cambrai which, about the year 829, brought discipline once more to the Frankish Church. The Anglo-Saxon version of this work—made, as Dr. Raith suggests, through a Latin compilation of the early tenth century nearer to the late tenth century English translation than to Halitgar's original—is here presented as the thirteenth volume in the new series of the *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa*.

Twice before had the work been printed in England: but here for the first time we have this interesting little text made conveniently accessible, together with a well-written introduction on the MSS., sources and general significance of the text, and brief notes on matters of interest for the student of Anglo-Saxon cultural history and on points of difficulty in syntax and forms of dialect. The whole is concluded with an index of the words, etc., discussed in the notes, so that one may find at a glance whatever one wishes to look up. Some of the notes, too, serve almost as a glossary on difficult words.

Dr. Raith shows that this text—attributed to the eighth century Ecgbert, Archbishop of York till 1851, owing to the misdirection of an eleventh century MS. note—probably was first made in Worcester in the days of the famous Oswald of Worcester, and that it may owe its origin to the constant intercourse between France and Worcester in the later tenth century. Moreover, as he says, the best MS. presents "the orthography of the Worcester School"—that of the *Vercelli Codex* and of Wulfstan's *Homilies* in the copy made by Wulfgeat. Rightly, Dr. Raith has chosen to print the text from MS. *Bodley Laud* 482, together with the more significant variants from others; but one may question the growing tendency among editors to rely implicitly on photography in their study of MS. authorities. Dr. Raith tells us that he has seen not one of the MSS. concerned other than by means of rotographs: and a visit

to England might have made his description of the MSS. more vividly illustrated and his use of some of them even more fruitful.

Though this Anglo-Saxon text is mainly merely translated, every now and then one comes on something not in the Latin which throws interesting light on contemporary society. Particularly this happens when the translator comes to matters of vulgar superstition. On p. 59 we read that a priest who hunts will have to abstain from flesh for three years, and a bishop for seven; and the fourth book affords abundance of entertaining information about the practice of witchcraft and magic in the later Anglo-Saxon period.

The offence of giving to one's neighbour to drink the water from which a mouse or a weasel had first drunk (as a magic charm, of course), is to be expiated by a layman with three days' fast, but by a monk so having sinned three hundred psalms must be sung.

Though not very rich in peculiar words, this, like almost every other MS. of its age, supplies occasionally matter of special interest to the philologist, duly pointed out by the Editor, such as *æht* = "slave" and *mishealdnes* = "negligence"; or the statement (p. 45) that the Latin *Sacerdos* is a Greek word compounded of *sacrum* and *dans*. Dr. Raith's linguistic notes expend more trouble than seems necessary on the explanation of fairly obvious points of phonology, and occasionally real difficulties remain undiscussed; but generally he supplies the kind of commentary which is the most likely to be needed by the ordinary student in the minimum of space.

There is an odd error on p. 18, where the footnote explains *wæpnedman* without showing consciousness of its actual origin (cf. the *O.E.D.* s.v. *Wapman*), and there are a number of misprints, such as (p. 55) *purh* for *purh* and (p. 65) *hus* for *husel*.

C. L. W.

SHORT NOTICES

Ratseis Ghost, or the Second Part of his Madde Prankes and Robberies [1605]. Reproduced in facsimile from the copy preserved in the John Rylands Library, Manchester. With an introduction by H. B. CHARLTON, M.A. (The John Rylands Facsimiles, No. 5.) Manchester: the Manchester University Press and the Librarian, the John Rylands Library, 1932. Pp. xiv+55. 6s. net.

The Governors of the John Rylands Library deserve the thanks of students of English Literature for the issue of this little book. It is admirably produced at a moderate price and is sufficiently curious in subject matter fully to justify publication. Dr. Henry Guppy, the Librarian, in a brief prefatory note, suggests that other unique books in the Library are to follow. May we perhaps be allowed to hope that a shorter interval will separate numbers 5 and 6 than the seventeen years which have elapsed between numbers 4 and 5?

Ratseis Ghost belongs to that branch of rogue literature, which, unlike most of the rogue pamphlets of Greene, Dekker, and Rowlands, purports to narrate the doings of particular men, though there is probably no more reason for believing that the exploits here narrated were actually those of Gamaliel Ratsey than to imagine, for example, that the jokes in *Tarlton's Jests* were the invention of Tarlton. There is indeed nothing very new or remarkable in Ratsey's methods of dishonesty, but it must be admitted that their historian had a lively touch. There are a good many phrases worth noting: "gligged" him of his money, on sig. B₃, seems to indicate an unusual form of "gleek," and the Justice of Peace who wished for "three or foure cold words" with the highwayman, on sig. C₄, illustrates an interesting use of "cold." The book has some curious references to localities in the neighbourhood of London which seem to have been especially notorious for robbers, such as Gads-hill, Shooters-hill, and Stangate-hole. The passage, however, which has caused *Ratseis Ghost* to be remembered, since its discovery by Malone, is the description of Ratsey's meeting with a travelling company of players, with the incidental information there given as to the small earnings of such companies, the reference to *Hamlet* and the possible allusion to the wealth of Shakespeare and his purchase of property in the country. Professor Charlton contributes a pleasantly written introduction.

R. B. McK.

Thomas Southerne, Dramatist. By J. WENDELL DODDS. (Yale Studies in English LXXXI.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1933. Pp. viii+237. 12s. net.

Professor Dodds writes well, with gusto and perception, and though it is difficult to agree with him that "Southerne emerges from a candid appraisal of his life and work with a greater importance in the history of the English theatre than he has hitherto been granted," on the whole he keeps his head. No one need quarrel with his conclusion that Southerne "was a powerful force on the side of naturalness in the contemporary theatre and that next to Otway he was the Restoration dramatist most active in determining the course of eighteenth-century tragedy." Professor Dodds begins with a "Biographical Sketch" which usefully supplements and corrects the article in the D.N.B. The greater part of his book, however, is devoted to Southerne's ten tragedies and comedies, of which he provides judicious, if rather monotonous, accounts and summaries. As a dramatist Southerne is in the embarrassing position of having been mistaken by his contemporaries for a genius. In a celebrated couplet Dryden once grouped together the "Courtship" of Etherege, the "Strength" of Wycherley, and the

"Purity" of Southerne's comedies, as though all the three dramatists were more or less on a par. Southerne is not in the same class as Etherege and Wycherley in comedy, or as Otway and Lee in tragedy. He is a sound professional dramatist, that is all, who gave his public what it wanted and was rewarded by being overpraised. Professor Dodds's study is thorough and accurate, but there is a slip on p. 109. *The Fatal Marriage* (produced 1694) is there said to foreshadow "the new morality that was descending upon the drama that had been Wycherley's and Vanbrugh's." Vanbrugh's first play was not acted, or indeed written, until 1696.

F. W. B.

Lautlehre der Hexameron-homilie des Abtes Ælfric (Inaugural-dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät (Sektion 1) der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München. Vorgelegt von THEODOR GÖHLER. Druck von Thomas Q. Hubert, Weida i. Thür. 1933. Pp. 182.

This is an unusually good doctoral dissertation on an interesting subject. Taking the late Dr. S. J. Crawford's edition of Ælfric's so-called *Exameron Anglice* as a basis, but keeping in view throughout all the surviving MSS. of this once popular sermon, Dr. Göhler has made a very competent and clearly expressed examination of the linguistic features of the text, following the recognised system of a *Lautlehre*, adding a good introductory summary of the MS. material and printed authorities, and a cautious concluding note on the results obtained.

To the student of late West-Saxon this book will prove both valuable and interesting: and if the conclusions reached by the author are not very striking—since the text he deals with shows pretty much the linguistic characteristics of Ælfric's other writings as preserved—yet many small points of interest are emphasised and clarified.

Particularly interesting to the student of Early Middle English and the *Übergangszeit* is Dr. Göhler's appendix on the English glosses in MSS. Bodl. Hatton 115 and Corpus Christi College Cambridge 178; and one could wish that the plan of the book had permitted a greater amount of detail in the treatment of these Worcester Glosses. The question of the accents, too, found in almost all Late Old English MSS. to a varying extent, which is lightly touched upon on p. 23, would repay fuller study: and in this connection Dr. Göhler would do well to study the outstanding and most suggestive articles of Mr. K. Sisam on MSS. Bodley 340 and 342 (particularly the one published last January) in the *Review of English Studies* for 1931, 1932 and the current year.

C. L. W.

Faust and Faustus: A Study of Goethe's Relation to Marlowe. By OTTO HELLER. (Washington University Studies: New Series, Language and Literature, No. 2.) St. Louis: Washington University. 1931. Pp. 176.

One of the most interesting problems of comparative literary history is the relation of Goethe's *Faust* to Marlowe's *Faustus*. On the basis of a note in his diary, Goethe is supposed not to have read Marlowe's tragedy before the year 1818, and the first inspiration to write a play on the same theme is thought to have come from the puppet play which he saw as a student. On this assumption the similarities and parallels between *Faustus* and *Faust* are considered as being due to the derivation of the puppet play itself from Marlowe *via* the popular Faust drama which was taken to Germany by the English Comedians.

Professor Heller reconsiders the problem whether Goethe knew Marlowe's tragedy before he planned his *Faust*, and attempts to controvert the orthodox view that there is no direct connection between the two. The positive evidence he

adduces is solely internal. He compares the text of the two plays, discusses similarities in plot and structure, verbal parallels and the characterization of the protagonists, and asserts that "the correspondences between *Faust* and *Faustus* are so abundant and egregious that nothing short of flagrant nescience of them can have kept the prevailing opinion snug."

His conclusion is that Goethe must have been acquainted with Marlowe's play early in the 1770's, when he was at work on the first version of his own tragedy.

Professor Heller marshals an imposing array of evidence, both positive and negative, in support of his belief, but much of it is not of sufficiently solid quality seriously to shake the orthodox view. His study will, however, remain a valuable piece of research. The Bibliography is good, particularly useful being the annotated list of puppet plays.

WILLIAM ROSE.

Ludwig Tieck and England. By EDWIN H. ZEYDEL. Princeton: Princeton University Press for the University of Cincinnati; London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. viii + 264. 15s. net.

Professor Zeydel has studied his subject under the microscope, and his contribution to our knowledge of the literary relations of Germany and England during the early nineteenth century presents a vast accumulation of factual detail and a number of hitherto unpublished letters and manuscripts. Tieck is known in this country chiefly as the collaborator of A. W. Schlegel in the standard German translation of Shakespeare, but his own writings were well known during his lifetime and were frequently reviewed and translated. He had a considerable knowledge of English literature, including the Elizabethans, and he came in contact both personally and by correspondence with many of his British contemporaries in the world of letters. The student of English literature will find much in these pages to interest him.

W. R.

Die Bedeutung Wordsworthscher Gedankengänge für das Denken und Dichten von John Keats. VON DR. HERMANN ANDERS. (Beiträge zur Anglistik. Heft. I.) Breslau: Verlag von Trewendt & Granier. 1932. Pp. viii + 66. Rm. 2.40.

Dr. Hermann Anders traces carefully and chronologically the influence of Wordsworth upon the thought of Keats, as shown in the letters and poems, and brings out especially the importance of Wordsworth's theory of the three ages and of the force of Wordsworth's actual personality for an understanding of Keats. There are, he notes, signs now and again of a revolt against what Keats felt to be too strong an influence upon him, a revulsion towards a poetry more of external beauty (e.g. *Lamia*, *Ode to Autumn*), but the return always follows, and the latest letters, written in the winter of 1819, show Keats still thinking on Wordsworthian lines. It is not Dr. Anders's intention to discuss whether Keats's submission to the influence was, considering the difference in the temperaments of the two men, altogether advantageous to him, or to speculate on the possibilities of Keats's later development; he has set himself the task of setting down the facts as far as we know them, and in this he has succeeded.

E. C. B.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

- ANGLIA, Vol. LIX. (Neue Folge XLVII.), April 1935—
 Untersuchungen über die germanischen schwachen Verben III.
 Klasse (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Altenglischen)
 (H. M. Flasdieck), pp. 1-192.
 Sailors' Pronunciation in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century
 (W. Matthews), pp. 193-251.
 Was Ambrose Philips a Ballad Editor? (Lillian de la Torre Bueno),
 pp. 252-70.
 Editorship of the 1723 *Collection of Old Ballads*.
 Ae. tō-sōcning (W. Krogmann), pp. 271-72.
- BODLEIAN QUARTERLY RECORD, Vol. VII., 4th Quarter, 1934—
 William Walsh's Letters and Poems in MS. Malone 9 (Phyllis
 Freeman), pp. 503-7.
 The Contributors to *The Rambler* and *The Idler* (D. Nichol Smith),
 pp. 508-09.
 MS. notes in Bishop Percy's copies.
- BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, MANCHESTER, Vol. 19, January
 1935—
 Shakespeare's Jew (Richmond Noble), pp. 28-31.
 Note on *Merchant of Venice*, I. iii. 42; reply by H. B. Charlton.
 Falstaff (H. B. Charlton), pp. 46-89.
 Letters addressed to Mrs. Gaskell by Celebrated Contemporaries
 (Ross D. Waller), pp. 102-69.
 Letters in the John Rylands Library: text and commentary.
 Herford and International Literature (Lascelles Abercrombie),
 pp. 216-29.
 Hand-List of Additions to the Collection of English Manuscripts in
 the J.R.L., 1928-35 (Moses Tyson), pp. 230-54.
- ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 69, January 1935—
Beowulf 1107 and 2577: Hoards, Swords, and Shields (Arthur
 E. DuBois), pp. 321-28.
 Altenglischer Mönchsaberglaube (Heinrich Henel), pp. 329-49.
 Hamlet's Schoolfellows (J. W. Draper), pp. 350-66.
 Die Geschwister Powys: Herkunft und Familiengeschichtliches,
 Bekenntnisse und Geständnisse (Karl Arns), pp. 367-72.
 T. S. Eliots religiöse Entwicklung (Hans Häusermann), pp. 373-91.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 377

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XVII., April 1935—

The Earlier English Works of Sir Thomas More (W. A. G. Doyle-Davidson), pp. 49-70.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Vol. 167 (New Series 67), March 1935—

Mittelenglische Todesgedichte (K. Brunner), pp. 20-35.

Zu altenglischen Dichtungen (Fr. Klaeber), pp. 36-41.

Notes on *A Prayer*, *The Husband's Message*, *The Wife's Complaint* and *Deor*.

Ac. *fleard* n.—aisl. *flárd* n.—ac. *reord* < **red*? (F. Mezger), pp. 66-67.

Taktumstellung und schwebende Betonung (K. Luick), pp. 67-68.

Note on article by A. Eichler; reply, p. 68.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIV., January 1935—

Spenser and the *Zodiake of Life* (Rosemond Tuve), pp. 1-19.

Wulfhlið (*Beowulf*, l. 1358) (Norman E. Eliason), pp. 20-23.

Association of wolves and cliffs.

Chaucer's Debt to Sacrobosco (S. W. Harvey), pp. 34-38.

The Astrolabe and the *Sphaera Mundi*.

"Faldyng" and "Medlee" (M. Channing Linthicum), pp. 39-41.

Fourteenth-century woollen cloths.

Jón Þorláksson—Icelandic Translator of Pope and Milton (Richard Beck), pp. 74-100.

Percy's *History of the Wolf in Great Britain* (Cleans Brooks, Jr.), pp. 101-03.

LEEDS STUDIES IN ENGLISH AND KINDRED LANGUAGES, Number 3, 1934—

E. M. Wright: A Bibliography (B.D.), p. 1.

O.E. "wēofod" (A. S. C. Ross), pp. 2-6.

O.E. "afigen": Ossete "fēzōnäg" (A. S. C. Ross and H. W. Bailey), pp. 7-9.

Collation of an extract from the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (D. E. Chadwick, C. B. Judge, and A. S. C. Ross), pp. 10-16.

Recipes from Harley 2253 (G. L. Brook), pp. 17-19.

Lexicographical notes.

Notes on *Athelston* (G. Taylor), pp. 20-29.

The Ireland Blackburne Manuscript of the Seven Penitential Psalms, *The Pricke of Conscience* and *Lamentacio Sancti Anselmi* (B. Dickins), pp. 30-36.

The Lambeth Palace MS. of the *Awntyrs off Arthure* (A. G. Hooper), pp. 37-43.

Arabic Words in Ben Jonson (W. Taylor), pp. 44-50.

LIBRARY, Vol. XV., March 1935—

The Harington Manuscript at Arundel Castle and Related Documents (Ruth Hughey), pp. 388-444.
Sixteenth-century anthology of verse.

An Early List of Elizabethan Plays (Giles E. Dawson), pp. 445-56.
In Henry Oxinden's library, c. 1663-70.

Annals of Merchant Taylors' School Library (R. T. D. Sayle)
pp. 457-80.

Giving catalogue of 1662.

Shakespeare and the Reporters (W. Matthews), pp. 481-98.

Alice and the Stationers (W. W. Greg), pp. 499-500.

Relationships of Alice Norton.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. L., January 1935—

The Sources of *Fouke Fitz Warin* (Sidney Painter), pp. 13-15.

Local legends rather than family tradition.

Goldsmith's *Life of Bolingbroke* and the *Biographia Britannica* (Arthur Friedman), pp. 25-29.

Extent of Goldsmith's debt.

The Date of Burke's *Sublime and Beautiful* (Helen L. Drew), pp. 29-31.

Evidence for April 21, 1757.

Defoe on Milton (Edward G. Fletcher), pp. 31-32.

Two references in the *Review*.

A Seventeenth-Century *Guiliver* (G. S. McCue), pp. 32-34.

Narrative in *The Weekly Comedy*, May 10, 1699.

Two Notes on *Epipsychidion* (Frederick L. Jones), p. 40.

Christ a Fury? (Claude E. Jones), p. 41.

Note on *Prometheus Unbound*.

Care and Carelessness in Hardy (Carl J. Weber), pp. 41-43.

In *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*.

— February —

An O. E. Gloss: *Ober eliman.innannorum* (Herbert Meritt), pp. 77-82.

Suggested explanation.

A Note on Chaucer's Friar (Karl Young), pp. 83-85.

Parallel in Memorandum of 1321.

Chaucer's *Ladyes Foure and Twenty* (Lilla Train), pp. 85-87.

Parallel to the *Wife of Bath's Tale* in Walter Map.

Another "Canterbury Tale" (Louis W. Chappell), pp. 87-88.

Chaucer allusion in Byrd's *Westover Manuscripts*.

Suggested Repunctuation of a Passage in *Beowulf* (F. G. Cassidy), pp. 88-89.

Ll. 745-49.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 379

Beowulf, 489-490 (Arthur E. DuBois), pp. 89-90.

The Chronology of French Loan-Words in English (Albert C. Baugh), pp. 90-93.

Hoodlum (John T. Krumpelmann), pp. 93-95.

Suggested German derivation.

"Water Fastand" (Robert Withington), pp. 95-96.

Note on *Secunda Pastorum*, l. 352: for "walter"?

A Second MS. of Wyclif's *De Dominio Civili* (W. P. Reeves), pp. 96-98.
In the *Bibliothèque Nationale*.

Belphegor in *Grim the Collier* and Riche's *Farewell* (D. W. Thompson), pp. 99-102.

Variant versions of story.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXX., April 1935—

The York Bakers' Play of the Last Supper (Anna J. Mill), pp. 145-58.
Evidence of Accounts from 1543 to 1580.

Ut Pictura Poesis (Cicely Davies), pp. 159-69.

Inter-relation of poetry and painting in the eighteenth century.

English Geography in Malory's "Morte D'Arthur" (George R. Stewart, Jr.), pp. 204-09.

Significance of Malory's localisations.

Printed Books with Gabriel Harvey's Autograph or MS. Notes (G. C. Moore Smith), p. 209.

Additions to previous lists.

The Old English Word "sætlicas" (W. J. Redbond), pp. 210-11.

A scribal error for *sæ-tilias*?

Etymology of "Codlin" (E. Weekley), pp. 211-12.

Evidence that it derives from *cœur-de-lion*.

The Anglo-Norman Sermon of Thomas of Hales (M. Dominica Legge), pp. 212-18.

Text and discussion of MS. of c. 1270.

Sir Henry Lee's Entertainment of Elizabeth in 1592 (E. K. Chambers), p. 218.

Reply to Mr. Leech.

Milton and the Mosaic Law (A. Sewell), p. 218.

Correction of an error in his article in the January number.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXII., February 1935—

The Telescope and Imagination (Marjorie Nicolson), pp. 233-60.

Richard Crashaw, "Catechist and Curate" (Austin Warren), pp. 261-69.

Additional biographical information.

Rowe's Debt to *Paradise Lost* (George W. Whiting), pp. 271-79.

Goldsmith and the *Weekly Magazine* (Arthur Friedman), pp. 281-99.
Seven unidentified contributions?

James Hammond and the Quatrain of Gray's *Elegy* (J. Fisher), pp. 301-10.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. 20, April 1935—

The "Definite Forms," I (R. Volbeda), pp. 198-212.
Tenses in modern English.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 168, February 9, 1935—

Some Notes on Dryden, Cowley, and Shadwell (Harold Brooks),
pp. 94-95.

In *Marriage Asserted*, 1674, and *Remarks upon Remarques*, 1673.

The Name "Hudibras" (G. W. Duffett), p. 96.

From Jonson's *New Inn*? Reply by E. Bensly, March 2, p. 160.

— February 16—

Predecessors of *The Tale of a Tub* (Benjamin Boyce), pp. 110-11.

Date of writing of *The Men and Women Saints*.

Hamlet: "This too too sullied flesh" (I. ii. 219) (H. W. Crundell),
p. 114.

Analogy of a passage in Donne's Devotions.

Lancashire Periodicals printed before 1801 (W. J. Lang), pp. 116-17.

Reply by R. S. B., March 2, p. 159.

"Leading Apes in Hell" (W. W. Gill), p. 122.

Further references.

— February 23—

The *Athenæum* and Bulwer Lytton (V. R.), pp. 128-29.

The attack in *Paul Clifford*.

— March 2—

Milton a Jesuit (G. W. Whiting), pp. 150-51.

Accusation in Pelling's *The Good Old Way*, 1680.

— March 16—

Dialect Words of South Somerset (W. W. Gill), p. 188.

Recorded in *The Book of Huish*. Note by L. Phillips, April 13, p. 266.

— April 6—

Swift and Heywood (J. W. McCain, Jr.), pp. 236-38.

The Battle of the Books and *The Spider and the Flie*.

XVII-Century Uses of "Face" (H. W. Crundell), p. 241.

Note on *Julius Caesar*, II. i. 110.

— April 13—

"Lady du Lake" (R. H. Perkinson), pp. 260-61.

Note on *The Wild Gallant*: seventeenth-century usage of the phrase.

"Slithy Toves" (William Sloane), p. 261.

"Slithy" used by Whately and Bunyan.

— April 20—

The Times in Paris in 1788 (W. Roberts), pp. 272-73.

Notes on two Poems by James Thomson (E. G. Fletcher), pp. 274-75.

"On the Death of His Mother" and "To Dr. De La Cour."

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 381

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XIV., January 1935—

Milton's Prose Style (Elbert N. S. Thompson), pp. 1-15.

Ophelia and Laertes (John W. Draper), pp. 38-53.

"Distrust" of Imagination in English Neo-Classicism (Donald F. Bond), pp. 54-69.

James Thomson's Ethical Theory and Scientific Rationalism (Herbert Drennon), pp. 70-82.

The Elizabethan Entertainment and *The Faerie Queene* (Howard W. Hintz), pp. 83-90.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. L., March 1935—

The Langland Myth (Oscar Cargill), pp. 36-56.

Bishop Brunton and the Fable of the Rats (Eleanor H. Kellogg), pp. 57-68.

Date of Brunton's sermon: 18 May 1376.

The Two Petros in the *Monkes Tale* (Haldeen Braddy), pp. 69-80.

Date of the *Tale*.

Satire in *Sir Thopas* (W. W. Lawrence), pp. 81-91.

Literary, not political.

The Source of Chaucer's *Melibeus* (J. Burke Severs), pp. 92-99.

The *Canterbury Tales* in 1400 (J. S. P. Tatlock), pp. 100-39.

Evidence as to their position at Chaucer's death. Note on the Hengwrt MS.

E. K. is Spenser (Agnes D. Kuersteiner), pp. 140-55.

Milton's Debt to Wolleb's *Compendium Theologiae Christianae* (Maurice Kelley), pp. 156-65.

The Development of the Rhetoric and Metre of the Heroic Couplet, especially in 1625-1645 (Ruth C. Wallerstein), pp. 166-209.

The Satiric Background of the Attack on the Puritans in Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* (C. M. Webster), pp. 210-23.

The Relation of Coleridge's *Ode on Dejection* to Wordsworth's *Ode on Intimations of Immortality* (F. M. Smith), pp. 224-34.

Suggestions that Coleridge's Ode was inspired by Wordsworth's.

Scott's Theory and Practice concerning the Use of the Supernatural in Prose Fiction in Relation to the Chronology of the Waverley Novels (Mody C. Boatright), pp. 235-61.

Lytton's Theories of Prose Fiction (Harold H. Watts), pp. 274-89.

Irony in Hardy and Conrad (R. G. Lillard), pp. 316-22.

SPECULUM, Vol. X., January 1935—

The Vercelli Book: A New Hypothesis (S. J. Herben, Jr.), pp. 91-94.

Taken to Vercelli by Ulf, Bishop of Dorchester?

SPECULUM, Vol., X., April—

Glastonbury Abbey and the Fusing of English Literary Culture
(C. H. Slover), pp. 147-60.

John Heyron of Newton Plecy, Somerset (Russell Krauss), pp. 187-89.
Identity of Mary Chaucer's first husband.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXII., April 1935—

News Out of Munster: A Document in Spenser's Hand (Raymond
Jenkins), pp. 125-30.
Report of 1582.

Spenser's *Four Hymnes*: Addenda (Josephine W. Bennett), pp.
131-57.

Spenser's Theory of Friendship: An Elizabethan Commonplace
(Charles G. Smith), pp. 158-69.

The Anatomie of Absurditie: A Study in Literary Apprenticeship
(D. C. Allen), pp. 170-76.

The Non-Shakespearian *Richard II* and Shakespeare's *Henry IV*
Part I (J. J. Elson), pp. 177-88.

Shakespeare's Debt to Hall and to Holinshed in *Richard III* (Edleen
Begg), pp. 189-96.

The Aesthetic Significance of Shakespeare's Handling of Time
(Thomas M. Raysor), pp. 197-209.

Title-Page Mottoes in the *Poetomachia* (R. B. Sharpe), pp. 210-20.
Milton and the Third Person of the Trinity (Maurice Kelley), pp.
221-34.

Terminal Pause in Milton's Verse (John S. Diekhoff), pp. 235-39.

The *Kommos* of Milton's *Samson Agonistes* (William R. Parker),
pp. 240-44.

The Faerie Queene, "First Part"—in *Variorum* (W. F. Thrall),
pp. 245-58.

Recent Literature of the English Renaissance (Hardin Craig and
David Patrick), pp. 259-375.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, February 7, 1935—

Bullen's Beaumont and Fletcher (D. M. McKeitham), p. 76.
Notes and letters in P. A. Daniel's copy of Vol. I.

A Fig for Momus (Sidney H. Atkins), p. 76.
Evidence that part was written some years before publication.

Ben Jonson's "Under-Wood" (B. H. Newdigate), p. 76.
Correct form of title.

Donne and Sir Thomas Roe (I. A. Shapiro), p. 76.
Addressee of letter of 25 November, 1625

Spenser's "Aetion" (Kathleen Tillotson), p. 76.
Identification with Drayton.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 383

A Rhyme in Browning (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 76.

A slip in *Flute-Music, with an Accompaniment*, l. 93?

Note by M. F. Ashley-Montagu, pointing out similar slip in *The Worst of It*, April 18, p. 257; further note by Howard Bayles, April, 25 p. 272.

February 14—

A Pope Problem (Howard P. Vincent), p. 92.

Authorship of *Mr. Taste's Tour*, 1733.

Notes on Ben Jonson (G. B. Johnston), p. 92.

In a copy of the 1640 Folio.

February 21—

"John Wilkes in the Strand" (Thos. B. Shepherd), p. 108.

Identity of publisher of Churchill's Works, 1767.

The Massacre of Money (F. B. Williams, Jr.), p. 108.

By Thomas Andrewe?

"Perfuming Pea-Soup" (George G. Loane), p. 108.

Chapman's variant of a Latin proverb.

Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana* (Maurice Kelley), p. 108.

Further note on Milton's religious views.

February 28—

Chaucer and Boccaccio (Robert A. Pratt), p. 124.

Argument against their having met. Note by Edward Hutton, March 7, p. 143; further note by R. A. Pratt, April 11, p. 244.

Pope and Tickell (R. Eustace Tickell), p. 124.

Recipient of letter of February 12, 1723/4 (?).

March 7—

John Clare (H. T. Kirby), p. 143.

Whitaker's proposal for a collected edition of Clare's poems in 1864.

The Folger Folios (Robert M. Smith), p. 143.

Additions to and corrections of Mr. Shane Leslie's list.

Lewis's *Monk* (Louis F. Peck), p. 148.

Bibliographical notes. Further notes by F. Coykendall, April 25, p. 276.

March 14—

Thomas Walkley and the 1640 *Works* of Ben Jonson (A. G. Chester),

p. 160.

Evidence of petition of 1648.

Pepysiana (Edwin Chappell), p. 160.

"Newly discovered" journals known to Dr. Tanner.

Hazlitt and the Augustan "Rocking Horse" (S. A. Larrabee), p. 160.

Source of Keats' phrase. Reply by Peter Burra, quoting passage from Pope, March 21, p. 176.

March 21—

Bishop Blougram's Apology (R. E. Neil Dodge), p. 176.

Identification of "French book" of l. 833.

Allan Cunningham's Literary Ghost (Davidson Cook), p. 180.

Continued March 28, p. 216. Note by A. C. Deane, April 4, p. 232; further note by D. Cook, April 11, p. 248.

March 28—

The School for Scandal: An Early Edition (George H. Nettleton), p. 200.

American edition of 1782, and its relation to the London edition of 1783.

Jane Austen: Two Conjectures (O. H. T. Dudley), p. 210.

Suggested emendations of *Mansfield Park*, ch. 33, and *Persuasion*, ch. 20.

Arnold's *Faded Leaves* and *Switzerland* (Andrew S. Cairncross), p. 210.

April 4—

Dorset's Poem, *On the Young Statesmen* (Brice Harris), pp. 227-28. Evidence of authorship.

Mrs. Shelley's *Lodore* (Frederick L. Jones), p. 228.

Representation of Shelley as Horatio Saville. Further note on Mrs. Shelley's novels by R. Glynn Grylls, April 11, p. 244.

April 11—

Shelley's *To Constantia Singing* (Keith Glenn), p. 244.

Further corrections from the Harvard MS. Identity of "Constantia."

Poe and Miss Barrett (J. S. Varner), p. 244.

Error in dating of letter to John Kenyon.

Rasselas in Dutch (A. J. Barnouw), p. 244.

Translation (unacknowledged) published in 1760.

Francis Quarles (Gordon S. Haight), p. 244.

Biographical note.

April 18—

Coleridge's Copy of *Fears in Solitude* (B. Ifor Evans), p. 255.

Annotations and corrections.

Two Wycherley Letters (Robert J. Allen), p. 257.

Text of letters to the Earl of Mulgrave, in 1677 and 1685, from copies in the Harvard College Library.

An Early Allusion to Chaucer? (H. G. Wright), p. 257.

Reference to Mellibee.

April 25—

Lord de Tabley (April 26, 1835–November 22, 1895), p. 268.

The Beggar's Opera (J. R. Sutherland), p. 272.

Account of its origin in *The Flying Post*.

Milton and the Rabbinical Bible (Besa R. Dworsky), p. 272.

Richardson on the Index (Florian J. Schleck), p. 272.

Pamela banned in 1744.

The Hauen of Hope (F. B. Williams, Jr.), p. 276.

Identification of author.

P. 232;

ttleton),

of 1783.

ch. 20.
ncross),

227-28.

note on

ntia."

copies in